INDIRECT DISCOURSE

IN

ANGLO-SAXON

DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES
OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

JOSEPH HENDREN GORRELL

PROFESSOR OF MODERN LANGUAGES IN WAKE FOREST COLLEGE

BALTIMORE
THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
1895

INDIRECT DISCOURSE

IN

ANGLO-SAXON

DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES
OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

JOSEPH HENDREN GORRELL

PROFESSOR OF MODERN LANGUAGES IN WAKE FOREST COLLEGE

BALTIMORE
THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
1895

JOHN MURPHY & CO., PRINTERS,
BALTIMORE.

[Reprinted from the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. X, No. 3]

TO

M. G.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41545822_0115

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE.

INTRODUCTION 1

I. THE INDIRECT DECLARATIVE SENTENCE 4

The Conjunction þæt 4

Laws Regulating its Use:

1. In Simple Sentences 5

2. In Complex Sentences 5

Omission of þæt:

1. In Complex Sentences 7

2. In Simple Sentences 8

Use of þæt in Paratactic Constructions 9

Verbs Introducing the Indirect Declarative Sentence 11

A. Verbs of Direct Statement 11

1. Verbs of Simple Report 11

2. Verbs of Saying with the Subjective Element of Design or Volition 30

B. Verbs of Thinking, Believing, etc 43

C. Verbs of Direct Perception, and Simple Introductory Expressions 54

1. Verbs of Direct Perception 54

2. Simple Introductory Expressions 63

II. THE INDIRECT INTERROGATIVE SENTENCE 70

A. Verbs of Inquiry 70

B. Verbs of Direct Statement 73

1. Verbs of Simple Report 73

2. Verbs of Saying with the Element of Volition 81

C. Verbs of Thinking, Believing, etc 82

D. Verbs of Direct Perception 88

III. THE MOODS IN INDIRECT DISCOURSE.

A. The Moods in the Indirect Declarative Sentence:

1. The Subjunctive 96

2. The Indicative 101

PAGE.

B. The Moods in the Indirect Interrogative Sentence:
1. In Interrogative Clauses introduced by *Gif* or *Hwæðer*, 103
2. In Interrogative Clauses introduced by a Pronomial... 105

IV. The Use of the Auxiliaries.
Sculan..... 108
Willan..... 113
Motan and *Magan*..... 116

V. The Complex Indirect Sentence..... 117
A. The Indirect Conditional Sentence..... 118
1. After Verbs of Saying..... 119
2. After Verbs of Thinking..... 122
3. After Verbs of Perception, Happening..... 123
B. Other Complex Sentences in Indirect Discourse..... 126
1. Subordinate Clauses with the Subjunctive..... 126
2. Subordinate Clauses with Variation of Mood..... 126
a. Adjective Clauses..... 126
b. Adverbial Clauses..... 128

VI. The Order of Words in Indirect Discourse..... 128
A. The Order of Words in the Indirect Declarative Sentence... 129
B. The Order of Words in the Indirect Interrogative Sentence... 132

VII. The Infinitive Clause..... 133

VIII. Relation of Indirect to Direct Discourse..... 136
Results..... 142

INDIRECT DISCOURSE IN ANGLO-SAXON.

Introduction.

The study of Indirect Discourse in Anglo-Saxon has hitherto received comparatively little attention. We occasionally meet with discussions of this construction in grammatical studies of selected Anglo-Saxon writings. Kühn and Wohlfarht, in their treatments of the syntax of the works of Ælfric, have done little more than to mention Indirect Discourse; Nader, however, has furnished a far more satisfactory account of it as found in the *Beowulf*. Such studies are as a rule of a sketchy character and are also extremely unsatisfactory owing to the restricted field within which the work has been done.

In grammatical works of a more pretentious character, as those of Koch, Mätzner, and Fiedler and Sachs, the treatment of Indirect Discourse for the early periods of the language is of a very general nature, accompanied by few examples and no statistics, and consequently of limited value.

There are, however, syntactic studies of another kind which possess a far higher degree of merit; these treat mainly of certain constructions which play an important part in Indirect Discourse; the investigations are generally based upon ample reading and the results are satisfactory. Among these, the researches of Hotz and Fleischhauer on the *Subjunctive*, Mather on the *Conditional Sentence*, and Smith on the *Order of Words*, are worthy of special commendation. Owing, nevertheless, to the restricted syntactic limits of these studies, there is a frequent disregard for the modifying influences of many indirect constructions.

To establish definite boundaries to the range of observation I have adopted Behaghel's definition of Indirect Discourse, as given in his monograph, *Über die Entstehung der abhängigen Rede im Altdeutschen:* "Den Begriff der Indirecten Rede fasse

ich in der weitesten Ausdehnung; ich verstehe darunter jede Mittheilung der Worte oder Gedanken eines Andern, soweit sie nicht genau in derselben Form berichtet werden, wie dieser sie ausgesprochen hat oder aussprechen würde."

In brief, then, this study embraces all dependent constructions after verbs of saying; knowing and perceiving; thinking, seeming, and believing; teaching and learning; after expressions of petition and command, of permission and refusal, and of doubt and fear. I have also included dependent clauses after verbs which serve as colorless introductions to indirect statements.

The following texts have been used in the preparation of this work :—Fox's *Boethius* (*Boe.*), Grein's *Poesie* and *Prosa*, Heyne's *Beowulf* (*Beow.*), Miller's *Bede*, Morris's *Blickling Homilies* (*BH.*), Napier's *Wulfstan* (*W.*), Skeat's *Gospels* and *Lives of the Saints* (*LS.*), Sweet's *Orosius* (*Or.*) and *Pastoral Care* (*CP.*), Thorpe's *Chronicle* (*Chr.*), and *Homilies of Ælfric* (*AH.*).

The Latin texts employed are Holder's *Bede*, Migne's *Cura Pastoralis* (in *Patrologia Latina*), and Peiper's *Boethius*.

The following special treatises have been used :—

Otto Behaghel, *Die Modi im Heliand*. Paderborn, 1876.

Otto Behaghel, *Über die Entstehung der abhängigen Rede und die Ausbildung der Zeitwörter im Altdeutschen*. Paderborn, 1877.

Ernst Bernhardt, "Der Gotische Optativ." *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, VIII, 1 ff.

Delbrück und Windisch, *Syntactische Forschungen*. Halle, 1871–1879.

Fiedler und Sachs, *Wissenschaftliche Grammatik der Englischen Sprache*, II. Band. Leipzig, 1861.

W. Fleischhaner, *Über den Gebrauch des Conjunctivs in Alfreds Altenglischer Übersetzung von Gregory's Cura Pastoralis*. Erlangen, 1885.

O. Hennicke, *Der Conjunctiv im Alt-Englischen und seine Umschreibung durch Modale Hilfsverba*. Göttingen, 1878.

A. N. Henshaw, *The Syntax of the Indicative and Subjunctive Moods in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels.* Leipzig, 1894.

Gerold Hotz, *On the Use of the Subjunctive Mood in Anglo-Saxon and its further History in Early English.* Zürich, 1882.

J. Koch, *Historische Grammatik der Englischen Sprache,* II. Band. Cassel, 1878.

Karl Krickau, *Der Accusativ mit dem Infinitiv in der Englischen Sprache.* Göttingen, 1877.

Paul Th. Kühn, *Die Syntax des Verbums in Ælfrics 'Heiligenleben.'* Leipzig, 1889.

Karl Lüttgens, *Die Alt-Englischen Hilfsverba—'Sculan' und 'Willan.'* Wismar, 1888.

E. Mätzner, *Englische Grammatik.* Berlin, 1874.

F. A. March, *Comparative Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Language.* New York, 1871.

F. J. Mather, Jr., *The Conditional Sentence in Anglo-Saxon.* Munich, 1893.

E. Nader, "Tempus und Modus im Beowulf," *Anglia,* X, 556.

C. A. Smith, *The Order of Words in Anglo-Saxon Prose.* Baltimore, 1893.

J. D. Spaeth, *Die Syntax des Verbums in den ags. Gedicht 'Daniel.'* Leipzig, 1893.

E. H. Spieker, "On Direct Speech introduced by a Conjunction," *American Journal of Philology,* V, 221.

Georg Steche, *Der Syntactische Gebrauch der Conjunctionen in dem ags. Gedichte von der Genesis.* Leipzig, 1895.

Paul Wichers, *Über die Bildung der Zusammengesetzten Zeiten der Vergangenheit im Frühmittelenglischen.* Kiel, 1889.

Theodor Wohlfarht, *Die Syntax des Verbums in Ælfric's Übersetzung des Heptateuchs und des Buches Hiob.* München, 1885.

J. E. Wülfing, *Die Syntax in den Werken Alfreds des Grossen.* Bonn, 1894.

I. The Indirect Declarative Sentence.

The Conjunction þæt.

The dependent clause in Indirect Discourse is usually introduced by the conjunction *þæt*. This conjunction was originally a demonstrative pronoun denoting the inner object of the principal sentence. Reference to a following subordinate clause by a demonstrative is a common feature in Indo-Germanic.[1] There are abundant examples of it in Anglo-Saxon; as *CP.*, 113, 10, ærest him þuhte *þæt* þæt he wære unmedene; 181, 18, we magan oncnawan *þæt* þæt þa earman sint to retanne; *Or.*, 80, 28, Leoniþa *þæt* þa geascade þæt hine man swa beþridian wolde; similarly 82, 24; 148, 16; 150, 11, 33; 156, 7; *Bede*, 44, 20; 46, 12; 76, 7; 98, 5; 128, 4; 136, 13; 140, 7; 144, 21; 146, 5; 154, 33; 164, 20, 29; 188, 7, etc.; *Chr.*, 66, 23; *AH.*, I, 224, 33; *Boe.*, 136, 12; 142, 5; *Mark*, II, 8; *Luke*, I, 58; *Beow.*, 290, 535, 633, 751, 943, 1498, 1592, 1701, etc.; *LS.*, 532, 735; *W.*, 206, 28. This demonstrative came gradually to sustain the relation of the inner object of the subordinate clause and hence was naturally regarded as the common property of both clauses; the common relation thus sustained occasioned the use of this word as the readiest means of connection of the two clauses, and finally it passed over into the subordinate clause.[2]

A construction akin to the true deictic use of this demonstrative is the employment of *þæt* together with the verb "to be" to introduce an indirect statement; as *Boe.*, 182, 15, þe ic eow sæde *þæt wæs* þætte yfele men næron nauhtas; 208, 4, ic þe wolde reccan sumne rihtne racan *þæt is* þæt þa beoð gesæligran.

The general laws regulating the use of the conjunction *þæt* may be stated as follows:—

[1] *Anglia*, XI, 489.

[2] Erdmann, *Syntax der Sprache Otfrids*, I, § 97–98. See also *Z. f. d. Phil.*, VIII, 127, 289.

1. The simple dependent clause is usually preceded by *þæt*, as *CP.*, 39, 24, se þe wende *þæt* he wære ofer ealle oþere men.

When the dependent clause is itself composed of a number of coördinate clauses, *þæt* is generally found only before the first clause, as *AH.*, I, 78, 29, bebead *þæt* hi eft ne cyrdon to þam reðan cyninge Herode, ac þurh oðerne weg hine forcyrdon, and swa to heora eðele becomon. When, however, the contents of the several clauses are to be contrasted, or each one is to be distinctly emphasized, *þæt* is frequently used before each clause, as *AH.*, I, 294, 18, bebead him *þæt* hi of þære byrig Hierusalem ne gewiton, ac *þæt* hi þæm onbidedon his Fæder behates; *John*, XVII, 15, Ne bidde ic þe *þæt* þu hi nyme of middan-earde, ac *þæt* þu hi gehealde of yfele; *Or.*, 19, 32, Wulfstan sæde *þæt* he gefore of Hæðan, *þæt* he wære on Truso on syfan dagum, *þæt* þæt scip wæs ealne weg yrnende; *John*, IX, 25, an þing ic wat *þæt* ic wæs blind and *þæt* ic nu geseo; *Bede*, 242, 31, gehat geheht, *þæt* he a wolde liif in elþeodignesse lifigan and næfre to ealand hweorfan, and *þæt* æghwilce dæge alne saltere asunge, and *þæt* ælcere wucan infæste. Wulfstan employs this device very effectively to emphasize his statements, as 179, 19, is to geþencanne þæt is *þæt* hy rihtne geleafan anrædlice healdan, and *þæt* hy Godes ciricean griðjan, and *þæt* hi godcundan lareowan hyran and Godes larum fylgan, and *þæt* hi Godes þeowas symle weorðjan, and *þæt* hi oðrum mannum unriht ne beodan. In this way a true statement is often contrasted with a false one, as in *AH.*, II, 418, 17, 18. Other examples of the repetition of the conjunction may be found in *AH.*, II, 414, 5; 434, 3; 466, 3; *Boe.*, 144, 19; *BH.*, 119, 25; *Bede*, 102, 20; 212, 4.

The conjunction is also employed to mark off distinct groups of clauses, as *Boe.*, 172, 22, miht þu ongitan *þæt* þa godan bioð simle wealdende and þa yfelan næbbað nænne anweald, and *þæt* þa cræftas ne bioð næfre buton heringe ne þa unþeawas næfre ne bioð unwitodne; similarly *John*, VI, 22; XIII, 3.

2. In complex dependent sentences, where the main clause of the dependent sentence is preceded by a subordinate clause,

there are three possible positions of the conjunction:—(*a*) before the subordinate clause; (*b*) between the subordinate and main clauses; (*c*) expressed before the subordinate clause and repeated immediately before the main clause. It is not possible to state any universal usage, but the following observations may be noted:—

Position (*a*) is naturally of frequent occurrence, as *CP.*, 85, 5, tacnaþ þæt eall, þæt þæs sacerdes andgiet þurhfaran mæge, sie ymb þone heofonlican lufan.

There are, however, two tendencies at work against the use of position (*a*), especially when the preceding subordinate clause is adverbial: first, the objectionable juxtaposition of two conjunctions (*þæt* and the adverbial conjunction); secondly, the cumbrous construction caused by the presence of a long subordinate clause between the conjunction and the main clause of the dependent sentence. The first difficulty is occasionally avoided by expressing the subject of the dependent clause immediately after *þæt* and referring to it by the personal pronoun, as *CP.*, 389, 19, Hit is awriten *þætte* ure Hælend, þa he wæs twelfwintre, wurde beæftan his meder. But a far more frequent device is the use of position (*b*) by placing *þæt* after the subordinate clause, as *CP.*, 233, 16, þæm æfstegum is to secganne, gif hie nyllaþ healdan wiþ þæm æfste, *þæt* hie weorþaþ besewde; similarly 185, 25; 231, 10; 253, 8; 263, 14; 271, 10; 273, 20; 423, 30; *Or.*, 20, 19; 210, 15; *LS.*, 6, 74; 136, 311; *BH.*, 17, 1; *Bede*, 53, 21; *Chr.*, 256, C. 30; *AH.*, I, 30, 10; 48, 35; *Matt.*, XXII, 24; *Mark*, XIII, 29; *John*, IX, 22.

A third construction is, however, frequently met with; this consists in the use of *þæt* regularly before the subordinate clause and the repetition of it before the main clause; as *CP.*, 199, 16, Hit is awriten *þætte* David, þa he þone læppan forcorfenne hæfde, *þæt* he sloge on his heortan; *Bede*, 80, 24, Seo æ bibead *þæt* se wer, se þe wære his wife gemenged, *þæt* he sceolde wætre aþwegan; similarly *CP.*, 143, 1; 209, 13; 220, 18; 271, 10; *AH.*, I, 40, 34; 60, 26; 174, 26; *BH.*, 99, 7;

125, 13; *Or.*, 56, 24; *Bede*, 80, 24; *Chr.*, 221, E, 14; *Boe.*, 102, 24; *Matt.*, v, 28.

Remark. In *CP.* position (*c*) is more generally employed, while (*a*) and (*b*) are of about equal occurrence; in *Or.* there is a slight preponderance of (*b*) over (*c*), and (*a*) is comparatively rare; in *BH.* there is a decided preference for position (*c*); Ælfric's writings show a greater use of position (*c*), though this only slightly preponderates over (*a*); position (*b*) is greatly in excess of the others in *Bede* and *Boe.* Wulfstan does not seem to show special fondness for any one construction, though instances of position (*b*) are most numerous. On the whole, position (*b*) is most frequently employed; it avoids, on the one hand, the lack of clearness often felt in the use of position (*a*), and, on the other, the awkward repetition of the conjunction in position (*c*).

The conjunction *þæt* is frequently omitted in Anglo-Saxon. This is to be explained in two ways, according to the character of the indirect expression.

1. Omission of the conjunction in the complex indirect sentence, in which the subordinate clause precedes. Notice has already been directed to the fact that Anglo-Saxon feeling is opposed to the excessive massing of conjunctions and adverbial particles. The establishment of position (*b*) is a result of the operation of this principle; a further step is, however, taken in the simplification of the construction, and the conjunction is omitted. The large number of examples of the omission of the conjunction after verbs of all kinds leads us to regard this usage not as mere juxtaposition of the two clauses, but as a regular variety of the indirect construction. Some examples may be noted: *BH.*, 24, 9, geðencean we eac, gif oþer nyten wære to halsigenne, þonne onfenge he hine; *CP.*, 383, 31, þæt hi geðencan, gif man swa deð, ðonne ne timbreð he us healle ac hryre; *Boe.*, 174, 24, Ic wat, gif þe æfre gewyrð, ðonne gesyhst þu, etc.; similarly *AH.*, I, 134, 13; *Bede*, 134, 18; *Beow.*, 1104; *Boe.*, 142, 13; 210, 8;

216, 20; *CP.*, 311, 14. Also without the usual *þonne: Boe.*, 20, 17, Wite þu, gif þæt þine agne welan wæron, ne mihtest þu hi forleosan; similarly *CP.*, 407, 22; *Boe.*, 204, 15. In this construction the correlative sentence with *þa*—*þa* is very frequent, as *Bede*, 162, 21, secgaþ me, *þa* Oswald bisceopes bede *þa* wæs him sended oþer biscop; similarly *Matt.*, XIII, 53; or, without the second *þa*, as *Mark*, II, 23; *Matt.*, XI, 1. It is worthy of notice that the omission of *þæt* is specially frequent after verbs of perception; in such cases, the subordinating force of the governing verb appears in general to be somewhat weak, thus favoring the omission of the connecting particle; as, after *witan*, *Bede*, 134, 18; *Boe.*, 34, 11; 174, 24; 210, 8; *ongitan*, *Boe.*, 56, 7; *geweorðan*, *Matt.*, VII, 28; XIII, 53; *Mark*, II, 23; *Luke*, I, 41; VIII, 22.

2. Omission of the conjunction in simple indirect sentences. Of this construction there are two varieties:

(*a*) The connection of the dependent sentence with the governing verb is comparatively close and the changed mood and tense indicate genuine Indirect Discourse: as *Boe.*, 82, 27, Ða getreowan freond ic secge *seo* þæt deorweorþeste þing; *Beow.*, 2940, cwæð he *wolde* on mergenne meces ecgum getan; *Bede*, 200, 25, sægde he hit *gehyde* from þæm seofon Uttan mæssepreoste; *Beow.*, 799; *LS.*, 72, 373; *Boe.*, 40, 31; 82, 27; 98, 23; 126, 14; *Dan.*, 426; *Gen.*, 276; *An.*, 1110. We may here include also such peculiar constructions as *Boe.*, 100, 10, ic wat þeah þu wene [perhaps you may think]; similarly 224, 26. In a few instances the verb of saying is thrust in as it were parenthetically, but still retains its power of changing the mood of the following verb; as *CP.*, 423, 19, sio, he cwæð, *wære* on his limum; 389, 11, sio winestre hand Godes, he cwæð, *wære* under his hæfde; similarly *Boe.*, 82, 27.

(*b*) In many cases, however, the connection between the verb of saying and the statement made is looser; the genuine direct construction prevails and we may regard the expression as mere juxtaposition; the introductory verb serves simply to

make known the person who speaks, thinks, commands,[1] etc. This construction is frequent after *wenan* and verbs of petition or command; as *AH.*, I, 378, 4, Ic wene wit sind oferswiðde; I, 446, 13, ic bidde eow blissiað on þyssere tide; *John*, XXI, 25; *Beow.*, 383, 3001; *AH.*, I, 332, 12; 434, 13; *Cr.*, 233.

The use of the conjunction *þæt* in paratactic constructions is frequent in the *Gospels* and in the writings of Ælfric; elsewhere it is rarely found. This usage in the *Gospels* is due to the Greek construction of ὁτι with the indicative, which was in turn rendered in the Latin version and subsequently in the Anglo-Saxon.[2] *Mark*, X, 32, ongann him secgan *þæt* we nu astigað to Hierusalem and mannes sunu bið geseald, etc. [cœpit illes dicere quia ascendimus in hierosolima et filius hominis traditur]; *Matt.*, VII, 23; *Luke*, VII, 16; XXII, 61; XXIV, 7; *John*, IV, 39; VI, 14; X, 36; XI, 40. In a few instances the conjunction is not found in the Latin, but is inserted in the Anglo-Saxon very probably by analogy to the frequent examples of its use in such connections; as, *e. g.*, *Matt.*, XXVII, 11, þa cwæð se hælend *þæt* þu segst [dicit ei iesus tu dicis]; similarly *Matt.*, XXIII, 16; XXVI, 64.

Ælfric shows a decided fondness for the use of this construction; as *AH.*, I, 162, 22, Crist cwæð þæt se weig is swiðe nearu and sticol; 360, 31, awrat se witega Isaias þæt he is stemn clypigendes on westene; 236, 35, swa Crist cwæð þæt nan wer ne wifað, ne wif ne ceorlað, ne bearn ne bið getymed; 174, 4, hit is awriten on þære ealdan æ þæt nan man ne sceal hine gebiddan; 166, 19; 486, 21; 510, 15; II, 246, 20; 330, 24; 394, 31; *LS.*, 386, 62; 398, 238. The reason for Ælfric's use of this construction is to be found in his effort to preserve well known scriptural quotations in their original form; it is to be noted that occurrences of this construction in his writings are almost exclusively in biblical references; the usual con-

[1] Hotz, *The Subjunctive in Anglo-Saxon*, § 4, *a*; Erdmann, *Syntax der Sprache Otfrids*, I, § 311.

[2] Mätzner, *Englische Grammatik*, III, 423; *Amer. Journal of Philology*, V, 221.

junction follows the introductory verb of saying, but, instead of weakening the force of the quotation by changing it into the indirect form, he drives home the familiar, unaltered text to the hearts of his hearers. A good example of this adherence to the letter of scripture is seen in the curious use of *and þæt* in *AH.*, I, 588, 26, and he on ær his þrowunge us foresæde *and þæt* he wolde on þriddan dæge of deaðe arisan [dicens quia oportet filium hominis tradi in manus hominum peccatorum, et crucifigi *et in die tertia resurgere*].

In this connection may be mentioned the preservation in Anglo-Saxon of the conjunction in the indirect relative sentence where the relative pronoun precedes the governing verb; in Modern English the conjunction is universally omitted; as, *e. g.*, *Boe.*, 26, 26, þe ic ær wende *þæt* beon sceoldon; *Gen.*, 204, 3, þara þe he wiste *þæt* meahte wel æghwilc on fyrd wegan fealwe linde; *Boe.*, 20, 18; 38, 4; 192, 25; 240, 13; *Bede*, 408, 16; 452, 1; *W.*, 19, 1. There are, however, sporadic instances of the omission of the conjunction in such constructions, as *Boe.*, 192, 11, þe we cweðað sie nauht.

After certain verbs, such as those of thinking and seeming, there are frequent instances of the use of the adverbial particle *swilce* instead of the usual conjunction *þæt*, as *LS.*, 436, 65, wearð him geðuht *swilce* heo gewurðan mihte; 518, 513, þohte *swilce* hine on niht mætte; *AH.*, II, 104, 8, þu hiwast *swilce* þu þinum cildum hit sparige; *LS.*, 448, 126; 492, 93; 538, 826; *W.*, 148, 12. In *Luke*, XVI, 1, the use of *swilce* is obviously caused by the Latin *quasi:* se wearð wið hine forwreged *swilce* he his gode forspilde [quasi dissipasset bona ipsius]. When, however, the conjunction is to be repeated the second form is taken by *þæt*, as *LS.*, 492, 93.

The conjunctional forms *forðon þe* and *forði þe* are occasionally found in the *Blickling Homilies*, as 235, 13, wiste *forþonþe* se halga Andreas þa slep; 243, 17, 34; 247, 3; and there are a few instances of the use of the temporal conjunction *þa*, as *AH.*, I, 400, 15, Ic geseah *þa* se ðegn alyhte of his create and eode togeanes þe.

Verbs Introducing the Indirect Declarative Sentence.

The discussion of the syntactical constructions in the Indirect Declarative Sentence naturally divides itself in accordance with the character of the governing verb.

A convenient division of these introductory verbs is as follows :—

A. Verbs of Direct Statement, orally or in writing. After these verbs there is considerable variation of mood.

B. Verbs of Thinking, Believing, etc. In these expressions the subjective idea is in full force and the prevailing mood is the subjunctive; sporadic instances of the indicative are found, when the reality of the statement is to be emphasized.

C. Verbs of Direct (mostly sensuous) Perception and Simple Introductory Expressions. After these the indicative is the rule.

A. Verbs of Direct Statement.

1. Verbs of Simple Report. Of this class are such verbs as *cweðan, cyðan, secgan, writan, tacnian, gesweotolian, gereccan, singan, bodian,* etc. In the indirect expression after these verbs we meet more than elsewhere the characteristic feature of Indirect Discourse in Anglo-Saxon—the use of the subjunctive as the exponent of a statement indirectly reported.

According to Mätzner [*Englische Gram.*, II, 118], "Der Conjunctiv verleiht dem Aussage-worte den Character der reflektirten Vorstellung, d. h. der Redende giebt nicht den unmittelbaren Inhalt den Vorstellung wieder, sondern er spricht das Bewusstsein der Unterscheidung seiner Vorstellung von dem Inhalte derselben aus, welchen er zum Gegenstande seiner Betrachtung macht. Der Conjunctiv giebt der Aussage lediglich diesen Ausdruck bewusster (subjectiver) Reflexion und drückt daher nicht die in der Sache liegende Möglichkeit, Ungewissheit, Zweifelhaftigkeit, oder Unwirklichkeit als solche aus." This statement applies with great

regularity to almost all expressions under this head, but we must needs adjudge it inadequate, since it does not account for the presence of many subjunctives following the most frequently occurring verbs of saying. Happily, however, Hotz [§ 34] has supplied what is lacking in Mätzner's explanation: "As mood of the indirectly reported statement the subjunctive appears in a merely formal function, that to reflect outwardly the immediate dependence of a construction made up with the contents of a direct statement,—from verbs of saying, uttering, etc. Whether the statement refer to a fact or not, whether the subject-matter be vouched for by the reporter, as regards its objective reality and truth, the subjunctive does not tell. It simply represents a statement as reported. If the speaker wishes to set off a statement in its objective truth the indicative with its sub-amplification of fact comes in. The statement then turns out to be a reported fact, whereas with the subjunctive it is report and nothing more."

With these facts in mind, we now proceed to an examination of the indirect constructions following the various verbs of this class.

Cweðan.

Cweðan is the most generally used of verbs of direct utterance and the most consistent in calling forth the subjunctive.

1. Parenthetically inserted, with no conjunction. Instances of this usage are not numerous. *CP.*, 389, 11, sio winestre hand Godes, he cwæð, *wære* under his hæfde; *BH.*, 171, 5, oðer *is*, ic cweðe, se æresta apostel. The connection with the verb of saying is here very weak and the subjunctive is by no means as frequent as elsewhere.

2. The dependent sentence is the grammatical subject of *cweðan*. *CP.*, 235, 21, is wel gecweden þætte þæt flæsclice lif *sie* ðære heortan hælo; *AH.*, I, 546, 11, Nis he nanum oðrum halgan gecweden þæt heora ænig ofer engla werod ahafen *sy; CP.*, 141, 2, wæs swiðe wel gecweden þæt se efsi-

gende *efsode* his heafod; 95, 23, wæs wel gecweden þætte se wer *wære* unclæne; 217, 11; 219, 9; 279, 11; 285, 11; 383, 13; 389, 16; 465, 33; *AH.*, I, 310, 2; *Or.*, 36, 12; *BH.*, 161, 20; *W.*, 93, 2.

A few indicatives are met with, as *LS.*, 18, 138, þis is þæt gecweden is, þæt God *is* æghwær eall; *AH.*, I, 322, 1, swa swa gecweden is be þam eadigan Job, þæt he *wæs* bilewite. Two reasons may be given for the use of this mood; the reference is to well-known biblical facts, and the time of writing was in the late Anglo-Saxon period when there was a decided tendency to pass over to the indicative. We should undoubtedly have found the subjunctive in the *Cura Past.*

3. The dependent sentence is the object of *cweðan*. *AH.*, I, 4, 17, se deofol cwyð þæt he sylf God *beo; LS.*, 148, 26, cwæð þæt seo dæd *nære* him geðafenlic; *CP.*, 115, 20; *AH.*, I, 94, 17; 152, 14; 184, 14; *LS.*, 34, 172; 100, 191; *Or.*, 82, 25; 174, 25; *Boe.*, 228, 10; *Beow.*, 92, etc. From these examples one can see that the subjunctive is used in a merely formal manner to denote that the content of the dependent clause is a mere report, or that truth is dependent upon the character of the speaker.

In *CP.*, 107, 18, ic cwæð þæt æghwelc monn *wære* gelice oðrum acenned, ac sio ungelicnes hira gearnung hie *tieh*ð sume, we have the only clear example of the indicative after *cweðan* in the *Cura Past;* although the corresponding Latin verb is in the indicative ["variante meritorum culpa *postponit*], I attribute the anomalous use of this mood to the fact that the clause in which it is contained is separated from the governing verb by a preceding clause; hence the subordinating force of the main verb has been much weakened and the construction approaches direct narration. Similar transitions to the indicative are met with, as *Bede*, 390, 8, cwið seo boc þæt he *upastode* and *ongunne* hliapettan and in þæt tempel *eode* and aa *wæs* gongende; likewise *AH.*, II, 160, 16. Complete transition to the direct construction is occasionally found, as *AH.*, II, 96, 19, He cwæð þæt he cuðe sumne man on

Romebyrig, his nama wæs Seruulus; se læg bedryda, etc.; similarly *W.*, 233, 2; *AH.*, II, 528, 30; *Gen.*, 276.

The subjunctive is expressly used to denote a future event in past time, as *BH.*, 159, 26, wæs cweðende þæt his sæd *oferweoxe* ealle þas woruld; and especially in late Anglo-Saxon to express what is false or doubtful, as *John*, XIX, 7, he cwæð þæt he *wære* Godes sunu [false as it seemed to the speakers]; likewise in *John*, V, 18; VIII, 54.

The indicative is employed when a statement whose reality is to be emphasized is contrasted with another which is either false or doubtful, as *Boe.*, 210, 4, Ne cweðe ic na þæt þæt yfel *sien*, ac ic cweðe þæt hit *is* betere þæt mon swege þone scyldigan; 184, 22, ic nat nu þæt þu wille cweðan þæt þa godan *onginnon*—ac ic cweðe þæt hit *bringeð* simle forð.

In later Anglo-Saxon, however, the use of the indicative is more and more on the increase; as *LS.*, 34, 163, cwæð to þam wife þæt ða gewilnunga þyssere andweardan worulde *synt* swyðe swycole and þæs lichoman lustas gelome *be-þæreð* and to sarnissum *gelædað;* similarly *AH.*, I, 82, 26; 84, 26; 100, 30; 190, 33; 230, 11; 236, 8, 35; 364, 30; *W.*, 191, 3. By a comparison of these examples with *AH.*, I, 172, 11, crist cwæð þæt he *wære* middangeardes ealdor (a use of the genuine A.-S. indirect construction), it cannot be said that these indicative forms are to be explained simply on account of the objective representation of the statement, but they are in great measure due to the gradual disuse of the subjunctive in the later language.

When *cweðan* takes on the meaning "to admonish," "command," the subjunctive is freely used at all periods of the language, as *AH.*, I, 166, 13, cweð to ðisum stanum þæt hi *beon* awende to hlafum; but to make the jussive force more prominent, the usual method is to employ the periphrastic expression with *sculan*, as *CP.*, 63, 23, cwæð se uplice stemn to Moyse þæt he *sceolde beodan;* 93, 6; 95, 2, 12; 139, 11; 219, 9; 249, 25; 329, 8; 375, 3; *LS.*, 46, 358; 54, 398; 90, 13; 142, 389.

There are occasional examples of the direct statement after the conjunction, as *W.*, 210, 16, Drihten cwæð þæt six dagas *syndan* þæt eow is alefed eowre weorc on to wyrcenne; *AH.*, I, 162, 22; 236, 35; II, 394, 31.

The auxiliary *sculan* is used in the dependent sentence to express a future idea, as *CP.*, 91, 18, cwæð þæt hie *sceoldon* leasunga witgian; likewise *Bede*, 432, 28. Closely connected with this is its use as an exponent of prophecy, as *AH.*, I, 236, 23, se apostel Paulus cwæð þæt we *sceolon* arisan of deaðe; *LS.*, 510, 374; *BH.*, 167, 15. It is sometimes employed to indicate simple report, as *LS.*, 526, 613, cwæð þæt þær wære an man þe gold *sceolde* findan.

The construction with *willan* has also various applications: as an expression of promise, *CP.*, 397, 29, he cwæð þæt he *wolde* geðafian; *AH.*, II, 26, 9; 172, 9; *Gen.*, 47,—to denote volition, design, or intention, as *Beow.*, 199, cwæð he guðcyning ofer swan-rade secean *wolde;* 2940; *AH.*, II, 298, 31,—to express a future action, as *CP.*, 387, 26, he cwæð þæt hie *woldon* weorðan forlorene; *An.*, 1110; *W.*, 99, 24,—in prophecies, as *AH.*, I, 220, 6, se swica cwæð þæt he *wolde* arisan of deaðe on þam ðriddan dæge. It also serves as an exponent of customary action, as *CP.*, 243, 14, he cwæð þæt þæs Halgan Gastes lar *wille* fleon leasunga.

The use of the auxiliaries *magan* and *motan* requires no special notice; they are generally employed after *cweðan* in their normal function as periphrases of the potential subjunctive, as *CP.*, 308, 9, swelce he openlice cwæde þæt hine ne *meahte* nan scur þære hwarfulnesse astyrigean; *LS.*, 202, 130, cwæð þæt nan læce hi lacnian ne *moste.*

Cweðan is quite frequently used to render the Latin *num* and *numquid.* There are three varieties of constructions in these expressions:—

1. With *þæt* and the subjunctive, as *John*, IV, 12, *cwyst þu* þæt þu si mærra þonne ure fæder iacob? [*numquid* major es patre nostro iacob?]; similarly VII, 52; VIII, 53.

2. With *hwæðer* and the subjunctive, as *Bede*, 130, 8, *cwyst þu* hwæðer þu his monunge onfon wille? [*num* ejus saltitaria suscipere consentis?]; *Matt.*, xxvi, 25; *John*, vii, 26.

3. The most frequent construction is the omission of the conjunction and the inversion of the clause following *cweðan;* in this case *cweðan* may be regarded as having lost in great measure its force as a verb of saying and is simply used as an an introductory particle to an interrogative; as *John*, iv, 29, *cweðe ge* is he Crist? [numquid ipse es Christus?]; similarly vi, 37; vii, 31, 35, 41, 51; viii, 22; xviii, 17, etc.

Statistics for the constructions following *cweðan* may be found in the following table:—

	CP.	*Or.*	*Boe.*	*Bede.*	*Chr.*	*W.*	*LS.*	*AH.*	*Gosp.*	*BH.*
Ind.....	1	0	4	5	0	5	18	49	12	2
Subj.....	29	17	33	31	4	10	23	78	9	21
Willan.....	4	2	0	5	6	3	24	31	3	1
Sculan.....	18	0	3	4	2	1	21	17	0	2
Magan.....	1	4	1	3	1	0	9	12	0	2
Motan.....	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	1

Cyðan.

The indirect construction after *cyðan* is very different from that after the preceding verb. We must distinguish these constructions according to the two different significations of the governing verb.

1. *Cyðan*, as a verb of announcement, possesses a strong objective force; the statement is presented as a bold reality, and hence the subjunctive of simple reported statement is seldom found, and the more objective indicative takes its place.

The dependent sentence is either the subject of *cyðan*, as *Exod.*, 419, God is gecyðed þæt þu wið waldend *wære* healde; *Jud.*, 155, þæt gecyðed wearð þæt eow *ys* wuldor-blæd torhtlic toweard; *Boe.*, 42, 28; 54, 15; *Beow.*, 701,—or its object, as *CP.*, 409, 19, He cyðde þæt hit *is* se hiehsta cræft; *Beow.*,

257; *El.*, 607; *CP.*, 3, 2; *AH.*, I, 222, 16; *An.*, 700; *Jud.*, 55; *LS.*, 66, 262.

Instances of the genuine indirect construction with the subjunctive are very infrequent, as *AH.*, I, 128, 10, cyðdon þæt his sunu gesund *wære;* 468, 29, þa cydde sum man þam cyninge þæt his mæsta god Baldað *fealle*, and sticmælum *to-burste*. In these sentences *cyðan* merely chronicles a report. In *Bede*, 62, 31, þæt hie sceoldan secgan and cyðan þam biscope þæt Ongelþeod *hæfde* onfongen Cristes geleafan and þætte he to biscope gehalgod *wære*, the final idea in the sentence, the association with *secgan*, and the influence of the corresponding Latin subjunctive (*referrent*), all contribute to the employment of the subjunctive. In *LS.*, 174, 89, cydde hyre freondum þæt heo forscylgod *wære* for his Cristendome, the subjunctive expresses a future idea in past time. In *CP.*, 405, 16, gecyðde, gif we æfter þam hryre gecyrden, þæt us *wære* gero his mildsung, the subjunctive clause is the regular apodosis of the ideal condition; similarly in *Bede*, 374, 25, and *BH.*, 181, 35. In *CP.*, 213, 19, ðeah ðæm cyðe ðæt se domes dæg neah *sie*, the concessive idea pervades even the dependent clause.

A substantive is frequently connected with *cyðan*, with which the dependent clause is in apposition; as *Beow.*, 1971, Higelace wæs sið Beowulfes snude gecyðed, þæt þær lindgestealla lifigende *cwom;* likewise *Luke*, VII, 22; *John*, IV, 44; *Dan.*, 760.

2. As the expression of a wish contained in a command or admonition, *cyðan* is usually followed by the subjunctive. In this sense, *cyðan* is found in the *Cura Past.* almost exclusively in the gerundial form *to cyðanne*, as *CP.*, 189, 1, is þæm to cyðanne þæt hi hie *warenigen* ægðer ge wið þa ungemetlican blisse; 201, 18; 253, 8; 281, 23; *Matt.*, XXVIII, 10, cyðað minum broðrum þæt hig *faran* on Galileam.

Sculan is often employed in the dependent sentence after *cyðan* to express a prophecy, as *AH.*, I, 152, 17, cyddon ongean ðone blindan þæt he suwian *sceolde;* *W.*, 22, 5; 250, 17; *Cr.*, 297; *AH.*, I, 24, 24; 202, 3. In *Chr.*, 315, E. 19,

sculan expresses mere report: hæfde gecydd þæt hit *sceolde* beon mare gyld ['that it had been more his fault'].

Willan is used in the indirect sentence to indicate a promise but also with the notion of design or intention, as *AH.*, I, 192, 22, cydde se Ælmihtiga God þæt he *wolde* mannum ahreddan; *CP.*, 353, 4; *Bede*, 46, 11. It is also employed in a future or prophetic sense, as *LS.*, 104, 240, wearð gecydd þæt þa seofon gebroðra *woldon* on þam cwearterne þrowian; *Chr.*, 278, C. 4; *AH.*, II, 482, 31.

Owing to the strong assertive force of *cyðan*, moments of contingency or possibility are seldom to be found, and hence the use of *magan* and *motan* is extremely rare.

The statistics for the constructions after *cyðan* are as follows:—

	CP.	*Or.*	*Boe.*	*Bede.*	*Chr.*	*W.*	*LS.*	*AH.*	*Gosp.*	*BH.*
Ind.	8	—	5	2	0	4	5	6	5	10
Subj.	6	—	0	4	0	5	2	5	2	1
Sculan.	0	—	0	0	1	2	1	3	0	0
Willan.	1	—	0	2	2	0	3	5	0	1
Magan.	0	—	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Motan.	0	—	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Secgan.

Secgan occupies an intermediate position between *cweðan* and *cyðan;* like *cweðan* it is followed mostly by the genuine indirect construction with the subjunctive, but the moment of subjectivity is by no means so strong as with the latter verb, and hence there is more extensive employment of the indicative.

The indirect sentence is the grammatical subject after the collocations, *is to secganne* and *is gesæd;* for the most part, however, it is used as the object of *secgan*.

Secgan like *cyðan* is employed with two distinct meanings—as a simple introduction to a reported statement, and as a verb

of command.. The use of the indicative after *secgan* in the early writings is, I think, due in great measure to the effort to distinguish between the two meanings of this verb. It is to be noted that this mood occurs most frequently in the present tense; now, the use of *secgan* in the monitory sense is most common in the present; hence the most natural way to avoid ambiguity is to limit the employment of the subjunctive to expressions of admonition, reserving the indicative for the general expression of indirect discourse. In the preterite *secgan* rarely occurs in the jussive sense, and the regular subjunctive of indirect discourse is found with few exceptions. A few examples will illustrate this point: *CP.*, 301, 16, secgaþ ðæm upahæfenum þæt hie *afeallaþ* on þa bisene ðæs aworpnan engles; 231, 4, is to secganne þam wellwillendum mannum þæt hie *habbaþ* swa micle mede; 235, 10, is to secganne þæm æfstegum þæt heo *forleosaþ*. In the sense of command,—*CP.*, 231, 10, þæm wellwillendum is to secganne þæt hie eac *þencen* to him selfum; 215, 6, þæm unðyldigum is to secganne þæt hie ne *agimleasigen;* likewise 181, 14; 220, 24; 261, 3. In the preterite, however, the regular subjunctive of indirect statement is the rule, as *CP.*, 71, 2, hie sædon þæt hie *wæren* wiese; *Or.*, 70, 19, sædon þæt hie *hæfden* bet gewyrht; likewise *CP.*, 337, 6; 409, 20; *Or.*, 19, 32; 40, 9. This principle is quite faithfully adhered to in Alfredian prose, but in writings where *secgan* occurs seldom in the jussive sense no ambiguity could follow the use of the subjunctive; here then we have the regular construction of indirect discourse; as *AH.*, I, 100, 29, sume secgaþ þæt sum orfcyn *sy;* 364, 16, sume secgaþ þæt þu *sy* Helias.

The indicative is usually employed in universal truths; the present tense is generally found even though the governing verb be of the past; as *AH.*, II, 72, 24; 372, 1; *Boe.*, 202, 24; *W.*, 19, 2; 81, 2. The numerous instances of this mood after the first person of *secgan* indicate a tendency to preserve the speaker's own statements in as nearly the direct form as possible; as *Boe.*, 38, 7; 104, 15; 154, 23; 246, 31; W., 230,

9; *Bede*, 328, 24; 408, 16; 462, 28; 464, 31; *Matt.*, XI, 24, etc.

Remark. Hotz (§ 94) makes the following statement: "It is a fact worth notice that, when the subject-matter happens to be recorded from the Holy Scriptures, the indicative comes in with great regularity,—an eloquent testimony to prove how that book was to them the authority par excellence." This statement is made in the discussion of *secgan*, but, if true, must apply to all such indirect quotations. After a careful examination of three representative religious works (the last half of *Cura Past.*, and the first parts of *Ælfric's Hom.* and *Blick. Hom.* respectively), I present the following statistics. In *Cura Past.*, of 39 scriptural quotations in Indirect Discourse, 19 are introduced by *cweðan* and 20 by *awritan;* in these there is not a single instance of the use of the indicative. In 15 scriptural quotations in *Blick. Hom.* introduced by *awritan*, *cweðan*, and *secgan*, there is only one instance of the use of the indicative. In the 46 quotations in *Ælfric's Hom.*, I, the subjunctive is employed in 15, the indicative in 17, and the mood of the rest cannot be determined. Wulfstan also agrees essentially with Ælfric in this construction; with both writers the occurrences of the indicative in such instances are hardly more numerous than the ordinary use of the indicative in indirect statements in late Anglo-Saxon. Hence Hotz's statement cannot be substantiated and, when scriptural passages are indirectly quoted, the Anglo-Saxon does not depart from the ordinary construction in Indirect Discourse. When the author wishes to specially emphasize such a quotation, the paratactic construction is used. [See above.]

The subjunctive is often caused by the presence of moments of condition, concession, negation, and interrogation in the expression; as *Bede*, 374, 25, þa sægdon hie þæt him þæt *licede* and leof *wære*, gif hit his willa wære; *AH.*, II, 234, 12; *Luke*, XX, 5, 6; *W.*, 3, 3; *Matt.*, XXVII, 64. This mood is also used, when the statement is considered to be untrue, as *John*, IX, 19, is þis eower sunu þe ge secgað *wære* blind

acenned? The subjunctive is set over against an indicative, when a false or doubtful statement is contrasted with one of which the reality is beyond question; as *AH.*, I, 328, 18, ne sæde þæt halige godspel þæt se rica reafere *wære*, ac *wæs* uncystig; 364, 16; *Boe.*, 240, 26.

There are occasional instances of transition from the subjunctive to the indicative in the second or third coördinate clause of the dependent sentence; as *Or.*, 19, 24; *LS.*, 62, 202; *Boe.*, 140, 18, ic þe sæde þæt sio soðe gesælþ *wære* god and of þære soðan gesælþe *cumaþ* eall þa oðre god. Complete transition to direct narration is not infrequent; as *Matt.*, v, 32, Ic secge eow þæt ælc þe his wif forlet, be deð þæt heo unrihthæmeð; and se unrihthæmeð þe forlætene æfter him genimð; likewise *W.*, 222, 4; 223, 8; *AH.*, II, 372, 1.

There are sporadic occurrences of the accusative and infinitive after *secgan*, as *Bede*, 340, 19, hie sæde *heora modur* of worulde *geleoran* and mið engla þreatum *astigan* [nuntiavit Hild migrasse et ascendisse]; likewise 398, 15. This is an obvious imitation of the Latin. A somewhat similar Anglo-Saxon construction is that of the accusative object and predicative adjective; as *Cr.*, 136, *þone clænan* eac sacerd soðlice sægdon *toweard;* likewise *BH.*, 165, 3.

The construction with *sculan* is found after *secgan* in the sense of command; as *Or.*, 44, 8, het secgan þæt hie *sceoldan* þæt land æt him alesan; *W.*, 300, 16,—in a future or prophetic sense, as *LS.*, 152, 79, ic secge þe þæt þu *scealt gewitan* on þam sixteoðangeare; *BH.*, 69, 18; 143, 21; *LS.*, 400, 264; 510, 374; *W.*, 19, 1; 238, 10; *AH.*, II, 298, 4,—to express duty, as *AH.*, II, 604, 22,—to indicate an unvouched-for statement; as *CP.*, 431, 15, sæde Solomon þæt man *sceolde* cweðan.

Willan is employed with a distinct idea of volition or intention; as *LS.*, 406, 372; *AH.*, II, 504, 1. In *LS.*, 174, 71, there is a special notion of futurity present: sæde þæt he *wolde* þæs ærran brydguman æþelan truwan æfre gewemman. The moment of prophecy is thus expressed in *W.*, 250, 17; and a fixed custom is described in *Bede*, 318, 14, secgaþ men þæt heo næfre linnum hræglum brucan *wolde.*

The statistics for the constructions after *secgan* may be thus tabulated :—

	CP.	*Or.*	*Boe.*	*Bede.*	*Chr.*	*W.*	*LS.*	*AH.*	*Gosp.*	*BH.*
Ind.....	5	5	20	11	2	23	17	38	71	10
Subj.....	15	35	38	56	6	26	22	24	31	17
Sculan..	1	4	4	0	0	11	4	10	2	4
Willan.	1	5	3	1	1	4	3	5	1	2
Magan..	0	1	8	3	0	1	5	2	1	1
Motan...	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0

Awritan.

Indirect Discourse after *awritan* agrees essentially with that after *cweðan* and *secgan*. *Awritan* is extensively used to introduce a quotation from the scriptures or from the patristic writings, and is not generally employed except in works of a homiletic character.

The indirect sentence is the grammatical subject of *awritan* in the passive; *awriten is* ('it stands written') is followed either by the present or preterite of the dependent verb; as *CP.*, 217, 11, be þam is awriten þæt betera *beo* se geðyldega wer ðonne se gielpna; 339, 3; *AH.*, I, 166, 19; *Ælfric de Vet. Test.*, 1, 23,—*AH.*, I, 136, 27, hit is awriten þæt he *cwæde* dæghwamlice; *CP.*, 195, 19; 225, 4; *Matt.*, IV, 6, etc, *Awriten wæs* requires the regular sequence of the preterite, as *CP.*, 157, 16, hit wæs awriten þæt þa heargas *wæron* atiefrede.

When the indirect sentence is the grammatical object, *awritan* is almost always used in the preterite, as *AH.*, I, 120, 9, Matheus *awrat* þæt se Hælend *niðereode* of anre dune. The dependent verb generally observes the regular sequence in the preterite, unless it expresses a universal truth, in which case the present is most commonly found, as *AH.*, I, 106, 11, se sealmsceop awrat be Criste þæt he *is* se hyrn-stan þe gefegð, etc.

In the indirect clause after *awritan* we notice the same variation of mood according to the time of composition as

was observed after *cweðan* and *cyðan;* there is a marked transition from the exclusive use of the subjunctive in *CP.* and the predominance of this mood in *Or.*, *Boe.*, and *Bede*, to the increasing frequency of indicative forms in *BH.* and *AH.*, until we meet with the employment of the latter mood alone in the *Gospels.* Compare *CP.*, 415, 14, hit is awriten þæt Dina *wære utgangende*, with *AH.*, I, 314, 3, Lucas awrat þæt se halga hyred *wæs wunigende* anmodlice, and *BH.*, 21, 33, awriten is þæt se mon ne *bið* Godes leof.

When the indirect sentence is conditional, or when *awritan* has the sense of command, the subjunctive is almost always used, as *Luke*, XX, 28, Moyses us wrat, gif hwæs broðor dead bið, þæt his broðer *nime* his wif and his broðor sæd *wæcce;* similarly *Mark*, XII, 19. This mood is noticeably frequent in scriptural quotations introduced by *awritan;* these are very common in *Cura Past.*, of less frequency elsewhere, as *Bede*, 66, 2; *BH.*, 21, 33; 27, 11.

The construction with *sculan* is used in a prophetic sense in *CP.*, 93, 6, Hit is awriten þæt he *sceolde* beon gehired his sweg [scriptum est ut audibetur sonitus]. It is frequent when the idea of command is present, as *AH.*, I, 174, 4, Hit is awriten þæt nan man ne *sceall* hine gebiddan to nanum deofolgylde; *CP.*, 403, 1. It expresses a pre-determined event in *AH.*, I, 340, 26.

Willan is used in a distinct sense of volition in *AH.*, I, 136, 24, Hit is awriten þæt fela witegan *woldan* geseon Cristes tocyme. It expresses the moment of futurity in *CP.*, 257, 25, is eac awriten þæt se wund *wolde* halian. It serves to denote a threat in *W.*, 206, 1, and describes a habit in *CP.*, 419, 26, is awriten þæt se hund *wille* etan þæt he ær aspaw and seo sugu *wille* aspirian.

Tacnian.

Tacnian sets forth the indirect statement in a more objective manner than the ordinary verb of saying, and, when thus used, is followed by the indicative. It is often, especially in

Cura Past., used as an introduction to a command or admonition and is accordingly followed either by the subjunctive or by the periphrastic expression with *sculan*.

1. The dependent verb in the indicative: *CP.*, 295, 23, þæt getacnaþ þætte þara lareowa tungan þonne *wundigaþ*; *AH.*, I, 116, 10, seo myrre getacnode þæt he *wæs* deadlic; *CP.*, 279, 25. In the expression of a universal truth the present tense is the rule in the dependent sentence, as *AH.*, I, 116, 8, þæt gold getacnode þæt he *is* soð cyning; *CP.*, 309, 8.

2. The dependent verb in the subjunctive: *CP.*, 85, 5, Tacnaþ þæt eall *sie* ('must be') ymb þone heofonlican lufan; 81, 22, 23; 87, 3; 249, 21.

3. The use of *sculan* in the dependent clause: *CP.*, 81, 20, þæt tacnaþ þæt þæs sacerdes weorc *sculon* beon asyndrod; *CP.*, 218, 6; 397, 35; 449, 19. *Sculan* emphasizes the implied idea of duty.

The headings of chapters introduced by *þæt* with no governing verb expressed may be supposed to depend upon some such verb as *tacnian*. In these constructions the Anglo-Saxon writer follows mainly the rules mentioned above, but, as there is here a closer adherence to the Latin model, the language moves in a more formal channel.

1. Anglo-Saxon indicative corresponds to Latin indicative: *CP.*, VII, þætte oft þæs lareowdomes ðegnung *biþ* gewilnad [quod nonnumquam prædicationis officium et nonnulli laudabiliter *oppetunt*].

2. Anglo-Saxon indicative corresponds to Latin subjunctive; here may be classed the chapter-headings in *Bede*, as X, Ðæt Pelagius unrihtlice lare *onfeng* [ut P. superba bella *susceperit*].

3. Anglo-Saxon subjunctive corresponds to Latin subjunctive; as *CP.*, I, þætte unlærede ne *dyrren* underfon lareowdom [ne venire imperiti ad magiterium *audeant*]; similarly XIX, etc.

4. Anglo-Saxon *sculan* answers to Latin *debere;* the mood of *sculan*, however, appears to vary at pleasure; as *CP.*, XX, þætte se reccere *sceal* geornlice wietan [quod scire Rector *debet*];

LXIV, þætte þa untruman mod ne *scyle* læran [quod infirmis mentibus non *debent* alta prædicari].

Indirect expressions after *tacen* and *getacnung* follow the same laws as those after *tacnian;* as *AH.*, I, 232, 13, for þære getacnunge þæt ælc cristen man *sceal* lufian his nextan; similarly *Or.*, 204, 8.

Gesweotolian.

Gesweotolian sets forth the statement in a clear, objective manner, and hence the usual mood in the dependent sentence is the indicative; as *AH.*, I, 290, 20, geswutelode God þæt he *wæs* swa geæmtogod; *Boe.*, 256, 6; *AH.*, I, 516, 26; II, 54, 11; 58, 17; 72, 7; *W.*, 99, 22.

The subjunctive is found only when ideas of negation, interrogation, futurity, and the like enter into the expression; as *AH.*, I, 328, 26, ne geswutelode ('would not have declared') þæt godspell þæt he *wære* mid purpuran geglencged; similarly *AH.*, I, 564, 22, wearð him geswutelod þæt he æt Gode *abœde.*

The construction with *sculan* is generally used in expressions of obligation; as *AH.*, I, 382, 17, Min Drihten me geswutelode þæt ic *sceolde* his fotswaðum fylian. It is also quite common in the prophetic sense; as *LS.*, 56, 89, þam wearð geswutelod þæt Basilius *sceolde* beon bisceop æfter him; 446, 97; *AH.*, I, 498, 15.

Willan is not frequently found in the dependent clause; it expresses a future action with a trace of volition, as *Matt.*, XVI, 21, he ongan swutelian his leorning-cnihtum þæt he *wolde* faran to hierusalem.

Sprecan.

Although *sprecan* is very extensively employed with the direct quotation, it is surprisingly seldom used as an introductory to indirect discourse. The true subjunctive of indirect narration is quite consistently employed in the dependent clause; as *Or.*, 48, 26, monega þeoda sprecað ymb þone cris-

tendom þæt hit nu wyrse *sie;* similarly 68, 8; *Boe.*, 200, 11; *Bede*, 296, 22. When *sprecan* is used in the sense of command, the subjunctive is of course the rule; as *CP.*, 59, 7, Hwæt is ma ymb þis to sprecanne, buton þæt he to *foo* gif he niede scyle, and se þe swylc ne sie þærto æt ne *cume;* similarly *LS.*, 450, 137.

The indicative is, however, sometimes found after *sprecan*, as *Bede*, 152, 2, sprecaþ þæt he fædera weg *wæs fylgende;* so *Wid.*, 107. This mood is specially common in the expression of a universal truth, as *LS.*, 10, 11, se hælend spræc þæt he *is* ordfruma.

The construction with *willan* denotes future action with, however, a strong retention of the idea of design; as *LS.*, 506, 332, spræcon þæt hi *woldon* martyrrace awritan; *Chr.*, 50, E. 1, sprecon þæt hi *wolden* an mynstre areccan Criste to love. It expresses a promise in *Byr.*, 274. The use of *willan* is very frequent after the collocation, *sprecan him betweonan.*

Rædan.

Rædan has in general two distinct meanings: (1) to read, (2) to counsel, advise. It is commonly used as an introduction to Indirect Discourse only by the later writers, and the indicative is the usual mood in the dependent clause; as *AH.*, I, 58, 9, hit is geræd þæt Crist *wearð* to his gyftum gelaðod; *Matt.*, XII, 5, Ne rædde ge on þære æ þæt þa sacerdas *gewemmaþ* þone reste-dæg?; *AH.*, I, 152, 3; 244, 15; 306, 35; 308, 10; 608, 22; II, 44, 23; 153, 18; *W.*, 146, 8.

In the sense of advice or counsel *(ge)rædan* is mostly followed by the subjunctive; as *AH.*, I, 538, 8, halige lareowas ræddon þæt seo geleaffulla gelaðung þisne dæg Eallum Halgum to wurðmynte *mærsige* and *freolsige; Chr.*, 272, C, 27; 297, E, 19; *AH.*, II, 356, 19; 420, 1. *Sculan* is occasionally employed to express duty imposed by the adviser, as *Chr.*, 250, C, 20, se cyning gerædde þæt man *sceolde* habban gemot. When the subject remains the same in the dependent clause, the moment of design is present and *willan* is used; as *Matt.*,

XXII, 15, ongunnon þa pharisei rædan þæt hi *woldon* þone hælend on his spræce befon; similarly *AH.*, I, 162, 3.

In *Chr.*, 315, E, 41, the attention is directed to the result of the advice given, and the indicative is employed: þa gerædden þa witan þæt man þa ælces yfeles *geswac.*

The construction of the dependent clause after the related substantive *ræd* is similar to that above; as *Exod.*, 269, is on beteran ræd þætte ge *gewurðien* aldor; *AH.*, I, 316, 23; 502, 24; *BH.*, 205, 12; *Ælfric de Vet. Test.*, 2, 4.

Ætiewan, owing to its strong objective force, is generally followed by the indicative, as *LS.*, 128, 201, æteowian þæt he *is* þine edstaðeligend; *AH.*, I, 38, 8. In *CP.*, 241, 22, the subjunctive is used to express the falseness of the claim, he ætiewð þæt he forðæm næfre þæt yfel ne *ongunne.* When a command is implied *sculan* is regularly found in the dependent clause, as *CP.*, 222, 5, he ætiewde mid þæm wordum þæt we hie *sculen* milde mode lufian.

Andettan is followed by the true subjunctive of indirect discourse, as *AH.*, I, 116, 23, we ondetton þæt he soð cyning *sy;* or by the indicative after a strong affirmation, as *Bede*, 136, 16, ic openlice ondette þæt on þysse lare þæt sylfe soð *scineð; AH.*, I, 440, 27. The auxiliaries are employed as usual, as *willan* in the sense of volition, *Bede*, 136, 21; 220, 29.

Andswarian and *Andwyrdan* are very consistently followed by the subjunctive, as *AH.*, II, 248, 22, hie ealle andwyrdon þæt he scyldig *wære* to deaðe; similarly 122, 2; 334, 33; *Bede*, 120, 13; 328, 8; 424, 13. The construction with *sculan* is used with the sense of duty, as *AH.*, I, 454, 23. Similar constructions followed the related expressions *andwyrde secgan*, *Or.*, 44, 13, and *andswaru onfon*, *Luke*, II, 26.

Began (pretend) is naturally followed by the subjunctive, as *BH.*, 181, 12, begæð þæt he hit *wite.*

Bodian introduces a strong, emphatic statement in the indicative, as *AH.*, I, 246, 16, bodade þæt him *wæs* Godes grama onsigende.

Forleogan (belie) is followed by the construction with *sculan* in *LS.*, 396, 196, to express the falseness of the charge: forlugon Naboð þæt he *sceolde* wyrigan God.

Forsecgan (accuse) is followed by *sculan* in the same sense in *LS.*, 274, 181, he cwæð þæt sum men wære þe his wif forsæde þæt he *sceolde* hie sceandlice forligan.

Gefrege wesan is followed by the regular subjunctive of indirect discourse in *El.*, 967, wæs gefrege þæt Cristes rod fyrn foldan begræfen funden *wære*.

Gemunan, referring to a past event whose reality is unquestioned, is generally followed by the indicative; as *Boe.*, 164, 18, Ic geman þæt þu me ær *rehtest* sum wunderlic spell; similarly *CP.*, 333, 32; 397, 8; *AH.*, II, 250, 31; *Dan.*, 119; *John*, II, 22; *Luke*, XXII, 61. There are some examples, however, of the true indirect construction with the subjunctive; as *CP.*, 413, 13, swa swa he gemunde þæt hit oftor *wære* adrugod; *Dan.*, 625. When *gemunan* is used in the sense of advice ('remember to do'), the subjunctive is regularly employed in the dependent clause; as *BH.*, 73, 26, gemunon we simle þæt we þa god *don*. In *Bede*, 522, 19, there is an instance of the accus. with the infin. under the influence of the Latin: ic gemon *mec* geo *beran* þa iedlan byrðenne [me memini pondera portare].

Gielpan is followed by the usual subjunctive after expressions denoting a pretention; *W.*, 99, 18, se deofles man gealp þæt he eac swa *wære*. Similar constructions follow the noun *gielp*, *Gen.*, 25, and the phrase *to gielpworde habban*, *Or.*, 96, 29.

Licettan (pretend) is likewise followed by the subjunctive; as *Boe.*, 68, 1, þeah he ær licette þæt he uþwita *wære*.

Leogan is followed by a similar construction, whereby the falseness of the claim is indicated: *AH.*, I, 246, 2, þu lihst þæt þu God *sy*.

Onwreon is generally followed by the indicative, as *Cr.*, 95, Crist onwræh þæt *is* Evan scyld eall forpynded. With reference to a future event, either the subjunctive or the periphrastic

construction is employed: as *AH.*, I, 470, 11, onwreah se apostol þæt he biscophad *onfenge;* 480, 24.

(*ge*)*Reccan* is generally followed by the indicative; as *Boe.*, 160, 1, þu gerehtest me þæt hit *wæs* God; 176, 19; *AH.*, II, 96, 17. Instances of the subjunctive of indirect statement are, however, not infrequent; as *Boe.*, 164, 19, þu me rehtest þæt hit *wære* eall an; 182, 29, 31.

Settan is purely objective in sense and is regularly followed by the indicative; as *LS.*, 256, 308, se apostol Paulus sette on his pistole þæt we *synd* ures scyppendes gefylstan; *AH.*, I, 142, 4; 440, 25; II, 14, 6; *Gu.*, 459.

Seðan (prove) makes an emphatic statement and hence is generally followed by the indicative; as *AH.*, II, 414, 9, þa soðlice seðað þæt se *is* Hælend Crist.

Singan is followed by the subjunctive of indirect statement in *Or.*, 72, 20, swa hit sungen is þæt gind middan-eard *wære* caru.

Tellan is very consistent in requiring the subjunctive of indirect discourse, as *Bede*, 326, 30, þa tealde he þæt he hit *wære;* 374, 20; *Boe.*, 158, 12. In *BH.*, 203, 27, þa gesawon hie and tealdon þæt þær *wæs* eac syx hund manna mid þy lege anum, the use of the indicative is probably caused by the presence of the strongly objective word *geseon.*

Tæcan generally requires the subjunctive of indirect discourse; as *Boe.*, 146, 19, ic þe tæhte þætte ðæt *wære* þæt hehste god; *Exod.*, 527. The indicative is sometimes found, as *Boe.*, 198, 29, Ic mæg tæcan oþer þing hit is þæt þa yfelan *bioð* micle gesæligran, probably due to the emphatic form set off by the impersonal *hit is.* When *tæcan* is used in a monitory sense it is followed by the construction with *sculan*, as *AH.*, II, 278, 24, or by the inflected infinitive, as *AH.*, II, 216, 21.

(*ge*)*Witegian* is occasionally followed by the subjunctive expressing a future event in past time, as *AH.*, II, 42, 22, hit wæs gewitegod þæt he on þære byrig acenned *wurde.* It is mostly followed by periphrases with *sculan* or *willan* in the prophetic sense; as *BH.*, 177, 9, þæt witgodon þæt him heora

god *wolde* beodan his halgan sunu; similarly by *sculan*, *AH.*, II, 86, 6; *John*, XI, 51.

Wiðcweðan and *wiðsacan* take the usual subjunctive sequence of negative expressions; as *AH.*, I, 56, 3, ne wiðcweðe we þæt hit micel geðearf ne *sy;* 116, 16.

Word in such collocations as *to worde habban* is followed by the regular subjunctive of indirect speech; as *Or.*, 40, 7, þa hæfdon monige unwisse menn him to worde þæt sio hæte *nære* for heora synnum.

---

2. *Verbs of Saying with the subjective Element of Design or Volition.* Such verbs are *beodan*, *biddan*, and *hatan*, with their compounds; *manian*, *swerian*, *healsian*, etc.

Owing to the presence of the strongly subjective idea and the fact that the result toward which the action of the verb extends is not realized, the subjunctive is almost universally employed in the indirect sentence; occasionally the indicative is found to indicate accomplished action.

Beodan; be-, ge-, on-, for-, beodan.

These verbs, expressing in general the idea of command, refer not to an actual occurrence, but to an event which is to take place according to the will or design of the subject of governing verb; the dependent sentence contains, therefore, either the simple subjunctive or the construction with *sculan* to emphasize the necessary performance of the action.

Beodan is generally followed by the subjunctive; as *CP.*, 63, 23, þæt he sceolde beodan þæt nan man hiera cynnes ne *offrode*, ne to his þegnunga ne *come; AH.*, I, 42, 3; *LS.*, 456, 225; *Chr.*, 58, C, 40; examples are frequent in *Wulfstan*. There are occasional examples of *sculan;* as *AH.*, I, 246, 20, bead þæt ælc man swa don *sceolde; AH.*, II, 372, 15. This verb is followed by the simple infinitive in *AH.*, II, 254, 16, him budon *drincan* gebitrodne windrenc, also 262, 9.

Bebeodan is the most frequently occurring of the compounds of *beodan*. The dependent sentence is quite common as subject after *is* or *wæs beboden;* more usual, however, is its function as grammatical object. The simple subjunctive is met with in the subordinate sentence; as *AH.*, I, 166, 20, englum is beboden þæt hi þe on hira handum *ahebban; LS.*, 502, 253, he bebead þæt hi swa *slepon; Or.*, 120, 5; *LS.*, 316, 128; *BH.*, 145, 31; 155, 12; *Bede*, 228, 11; *AH.*, II, 8, 10; *Dan.*, 99, 449; *Cr.*, 1500; *An.*, 729; *El.*, 710; *Boe.*, 146, 13; *Matt.*, IV, 6. The construction with *sculan* is still more frequent, the preterite referring to a specific action, the present to a general command applying to any time; as *AH.*, I, 310, 26, God bebead Moyses þæt he and ealle Israhela folc *sceoldon* offrian an lamb; 446, 23, God us bebead þæt we *sceolon* hine herian; other examples of this construction are *AH.*, I, 92, 30; 482, 11; *LS.*, 488, 28; 490, 47; *BH.*, 213, 21; *An.*, 1698; *W.*, 13, 4; 17, 12; *Gen.*, 800. It is almost exclusively used after *is* or *wæs beboden;* as *BH.*, 183, 21; *W.*, 6, 1; 283, 24; 291, 27; 304, 16; *AH.*, II, 282, 2.

The simple infinitive occasionally follows *bebeodan;* as *An.*, 774, þa se þeoden bebead þryðweorc *faran* stan stræte of stedewange and ferð *gan;* 779; *El.*, 1018. A curious use of both this construction and the subordinate clause is found in *El.*, 979, sio cwen bebead ofer eorl-mægen *aras fysan, sceoldon* Romwarena ofer heanne holm hlaford *secean.* In *AH.*, II, 296, 2, *bebeodan* is followed both by the regular indirect subjunctive and by the direct imperative: Ic þe bebeode þæt þu *gewite* of þyssere stowe and *far* to westene. In *Or.*, 262, 19, the indicative is found in the dependent clause, since attention is here directed, it seems, rather to the fulfilment of the command than to the action itself: he bebead Tituse þæt he *towearp* þæt templ on Hierusalem.

Gebeodan is generally followed by the simple subjunctive; as *Or.*, 94, 23, þa gebudon him Perse þæt hie *hæfden* III winter sibbe wið hie; 104, 14; *Dan.*, 449, etc. The construction with *willan* is occasionally used when the subject of both

clauses is the same and the intention of the speaker is made prominent; as *Or.*, 54, 21, he gebead þæm æðelinge þæt he him fylstan *wolde; Bede*, 454, 9.

Onbeodan has a precisely similar sequence to that above; as *Or.*, 208, 34, hit Scipio oftrædlice onbead þæt hie hit ne *onginnen; Or.*, 146, 30, þa onbead he him þæt he him ðæs *getygdian wolde; Bede*, 58, 5.

Forbeodan is usually followed by the subjunctive and the negative particle *ne* is generally used in the dependent clause; as *CP.*, 211, 24, we sculen him forbeodan þæt hie swa ne *don; Chr.*, 53, 38; *Mark*, III, 12; *W.*, 211, 25. The negative particle is, however, at times omitted; as *CP.*, 451, 2, þæt us on oðerre stowe forbiet þæt we hit beforan mannum *don;* 451, 5. It is to be noted that in the translations there is a general agreement of the Anglo-Saxon negative with the Latin dependent clause introduced by *ne*. There are occasional examples of the inflected infinitive after *forbeodan;* as *AH.*, I, 218, 30, circlice þeowas forbeodan *to secganne* ænig spel. The accus. and infinitive is rarely found; *Matt.*, XIX, 14, nelle ge *hig* forbeodan *cuman* to me [nolite eos prohibere ad me venire].

Biddan.

After *biddan* and its compounds the subjunctive of the dependent verb is the almost universal usage; as *LS.*, 6, 74, ic bidde þæt he wel *gerihte* and þær namare betweox ne *sette;* 188, 319, þa bebæd Constantia hi to Gode þæt he hie hira bena *gehirde; Bede*, 400, 7, þa abæd ic georn lice þætte me *wære* eac lefnes sald to ærnenne; similarly *AH.*, I, 128, 6; 166, 6; *LS.*, 106, 291.

The construction with *sculan* is rarely met with after *biddan* and serves the purpose merely of a periphrasis of the subjunctive; as *LS.*, 150, 55, hine bæd þæt he him sendan *sceolde;* 36, 211; *AH.*, I, 246, 3; *Bede*, 242, 27.

As the subject of the subordinate is always different from that of the principal clause, the occurrence of the construction

with *willan* in the former is extremely rare; when used there is generally implied a certain degree of deference to the will of the person addressed, almost equivalent to the modern phrase, 'if you please'; as *LS.*, 506, 300, we biddaþ þe, leof hlaford, þæt þu gehyran *wylle* ure word; similarly 532, 732. In *Bede*, 100, 15, bædon þæt eft oðer seonad *wære* and heo þonne *woldon gesecan*, the second subordinate clause is not dependent on *bædon* but on a verb of saying to be supplied.

The auxiliary *motan* is often found in the dependent clause, as *LS.*, 138, 335, þa bæd Tiburtius þæt he beon *moste* mid þam papan. The infinitive is very frequent after *biddan*, especially in poetry; as *LS.*, 76, 439, bæd hine ealle *warian; AH.*, II, 182, 11; *Bede*, 38, 30; *Dan.*, 542, 559; *Byr.*, 170; *An.*, 1614; *El.*, 1101. In the *Blick. Hom.* there are a few examples of the indicative after *biddan;* as 191, 13, ure bædon and lærdon Romane þæt ic *gewat* heonon onweg; here the result attained is probably emphasized.

Biddon is frequently used simply as an introductory word to a direct petition, as *LS.*, 324, 71, ic bidde þe, onfoh mine sawle; 486, 225. The direct and the indirect constructions are often interchanged at pleasure, as *Luke*, XIV, 18, ic bidde þe þæt þu me *beladie;* 19, nu bidde ic þe, *belade* me. There is also observable a ready transition to the direct imperative in the same sentence, as *AH.*, I, 334, 25, ic bidde eow þæt ge *beon* gemyndige and *doð* swa swa, etc.

The statistics for the principal constructions after *biddan* are as follows:—

	CP.	*Or.*	*Boe.*	*Bede.*	*Chr.*	*W.*	*LS.*	*AH.*	*Gosp.*	*BH.*
Subj.	4	26	6	64	11	27	77	85	36	26
Sculan.	1	0	0	2	5	0	2	7	0	0
Motan	0	2	0	4	6	0	8	10	1	4

Remark. Wulfstan is most consistent in the use of the subjunctive after *biddan*, while Ælfric shows a tendency to the use of the periphrastic forms.

(*ge*)*Læran.*

(*ge*)*Læran* is frequently used by all Anglo-Saxon writers, especially by Wulfstan; the subjunctive is almost universally used in the dependent clause; as *CP.*, 189, 15, þa underþieddan mon sceal læran þæt hie ne *sien* genæt; *Or.*, 124, 2, he gelærde ealle Crecas þæt hie Alexander *wiðsocen; BH.*, 173, 28; *Bede*, 224, 13; *W.*, 67, 1; *Gu.*, 109; *El.*, 522. The construction with *sculan* is sometimes found, as *CP.*, 131, 3; þa þa he lærde þæt þære ciricean þegnas *sceoldon* stilnesse ðære ðenunga habban; *W.*, 68, 7.

There are a few instances of the use of the indicative in the dependent clause; special stress seems to be placed here upon the result of the advised action; as *Or.*, 148, 4, heo gelærde þone cyning þæt he hiene swa up *ahof; W.*, 9, 5, ongan he beswican and gelæran þæt se man *abræc* godes bebod; *Jul.*, 574. *Læran*, however, often has a weakened meaning, so that it signifies little more than the ordinary verb of saying and is followed by the indicative, as *Mark*, VIII, 31, þa ongann he hi læran þæt mannes sunu *gebyreð* fela þing þolian; similarly *Bede*, 372, 15, he wæs in gaste gelæred þæt he *wæs* from Dryhtne tigðe þære bene.

In *Bede*, 460, 3, the accus. and infin. is an obvious copy of the Latin. In *Bede*, 226, 26, we meet with the rare construction of the inflected infinitive: heo lærde *to healdænne* regollice lifes þeodscipe.

Hatan; be-, ge-hatan.

Hatan is usually followed by the infinitive, either alone or accompanied by a substantive, pronoun, or clause which bears to the infinitive the relation of subject or object. The use of the infinitive alone is not common, as *LS.*, 62, 195, se casere het sendan ongean þone ealdorman. When the object of the infinitive is a pronoun, the usual arrangement of words is

object-verb, as *Bede*, 34, 25, het *hine secan;* when, however, the object is a substantive or clause the order of words is most frequently reversed; as *LS.*, 42, 298, het *acwellan þone cristenan Philippum;* 30, 113; *El.*, 214.

When the subject of the infinitive is expressed, we meet with the subject-accusative construction after verbs of petition and command, a construction which is common to Anglo-Saxon, Old Saxon, and Old High German.[1] The subject of the infinitive generally precedes it, as *LS.*, 58, 214, se gerefa het *þa cnyhtas cyðan* þe þison; 64, 235; 462, 342; 488, 20; *BH.*, 217, 25; 219, 15; *Bede*, 260, 32; 266, 2; 462, 18; *W.*, 206, 14; 235, 15; *AH.*, II, 32, 22; 144, 2; 196, 19; *Gen.*, 39, 121, 145; *Cr.*, 1375; *An.*, 1575. The order, infinitive-subject, is very rare, due mostly to poetical inversions, as *Gen.*, 44, heht þa geond þæt rædlease hof *weaxan witebrogan;* 156, 2783, *Cr.*, 1025. When the infinitive has also an object the subject still retains its precedence, the object, if a pronoun, preceding the infinitive, and following it if a substantive: *AH.*, II, 86, 1, he hæt his *underþeoddan hine belifian;* 66, 12, het *hi geedstaðelian þa burh* Hierusalem; similarly *W.*, 237, 1; *AH.*, II, 134, 35; 196, 4; 246, 24; 342, 11; *Gen.*, 345; *Dan.*, 231; *Byr.*, 2. In only one instance does the subject follow the infinitive and this is obviously due to the poetic form: *Byr.*, 74, het þa hæleþa hleo *healdan* þa bricge *wigan wigheardne.*

There are also numerous instances of the subordinate sentence introduced by *þæt.* In *Or.* this construction is employed almost half the time; it is also very frequent in *Bede*, *AH.*, and *W.* The usual mood is the simple subjunctive; as *LS.*, 26, 11, het þæt he *heolde* þa romiscan gesætnysse; *Or.*, 170, 8; 204, 32; *LS.*, 406, 359; 442, 37; 464, 373; *Bede*, 254, 5; 320, 22; 388, 10; 454, 17; 462, 21; *W.*, 176, 16; 220, 12, 16; *Gen.*, 500; *An.*, 1505; *Chr.*, 230, A, 20. Occasionally the jussive sense is strengthened by the use of *sculan;* as *AH.*, I, 16, 3, het þæt heo *sceolde* forðlædan cuce nytenu; *LS.*, 200,

[1] Krickau, *Der Accus. mit dem Infin. in der Englischen Sprache*, p. 4.

92; 400, 261; *AH.*, II, 488, 25. At times the infinitive and the subordinate clause are both found in the same expression; as *W.*, 287, 23, God ne het us *gemelgjan* þa hælbendan, ac *þæt we þæm wædligendum gefultumodan;* similarly *An.*, 795; *Jul.*, 333, hateð þræce *ræran*, gif we gemete sin on mold-wege, *þæt hi usic binden and suslum swingen.* The last example is an excellent illustration of a common feature in Anglo-Saxon style, by which the unity of the construction is sacrificed for the sake of clearness.

Behatan and *Gehatan* have essentially the same meaning and differ only in relative frequency of use by different writers; the former is almost universal in *W.* and very frequent in *AH.;* the latter is preferred in *BH.* and *Bede.*

In most cases the will of the speaker is present in the action of the subordinate clause and hence the regular occurrence of the construction with *willan;* as *AH.*, I, 22, 8, þa behet God þæt he *wolde* næfre eft eall mancynn acwellan; 264, 2; *BH.*, 201, 36; *Bede*, 234, 31; 294, 23; 416, 10; *W.*, 37, 13; 75, 15; 109, 16; 144, 8; *AH.*, II, 50, 14; 176, 27; 212, 15; 224, 3; *Dan.*, 316; *Cr.*, 142; *Byr.*, 246; *Boe.*, 126, 9; *Beow.*, 2635; *Chr.*, 147, F, 10; 208, D, 20; 270, C, 2. When the subject of the dependent clause is different from the speaker, either the simple subjunctive is employed, as *Gu.*, 427, ðа þu gehete þæt þec halig gast *gescilde;* or the construction with *sculan*, as a threat, *Gu.*, 205, 542, or in a prophetic sense, *AH.*, I, 204, 17, God behet Abrahame þæt on his cynne *sceolde* beon gebletsod eal mancynn. In *Bede*, 242, 31, the simple subjunctive and the periphrastic forms are both used: gehat geheht þæt he *wolde* liif in elþeodignesse lifigan and þæt he alne saltere *asunge*, etc.

In *LS.*, 214, 79, se apostel behet þæm þe healdað clænnysse þæt hi *synd* Godes tempel, and *AH.*, I, 542, 19, he him behet þæt hi on þam miclan dome ofer twelf dom-setl *sittende beoð*, the introductory verb has little more force than the ordinary verb of saying and is followed by the indicative.

Swerian.

Swerian is followed either by the subjunctive of the dependent verb or by the construction with *willan*, since the moment of design or intention generally pervades the subordinate clause; as *Or.*, 190, 22, swor þæt him leofre *wære;* *W.*, 207, 12, Crist swor þæt se mon *wære* aweriged; *LS.*, 314, 97, swor þæt he mid mislicum witum hine *wolde* fordon. *Swerian* is frequently connected with its complementary object *aðas*, as *Chr.*, 142, A, 30; *Or.*, 70, 15; 162, 10; *W.*, 209, 26; *Ælfric de Novo Test.*, 18, 36. Either of the two constructions may be employed at pleasure; in *Chr.*, 114, 22, MSS. *A*, *D*, and *E* read "hem þa aðas sworon þæt hie hrædlice of his rice *faren*," while *B* and *C* have "þæt hie hrædlice of his rice *faran wolde*."

The construction with *sculan* is occasionally found in the dependent clause as the exponent of a threat, as *El.*, 685, ic þæt geswerige þæt þu *scealt* cwylmed weorðan buton þu forlæte þa leasunga; or in a prophetic sense, as *AH.*, I, 426, 6, ic swerige þæt þu *scealt* geoffrian.

Swerian is employed as a forcible means of emphasizing a simple statement and, when so used, is followed by the indicative; as *W.*, 214, 7, wit swergað þæt hit *is* soð þæt wit secgað; similarly 224, 29; 259, 7.

Closely connected both in sense and regimen with *swerian* are collocations with *að*, as *aðas sellan* (*Chr.*, 212, A, 24); *mid aðum gefæstnian* (*Chr.*, 192, B, 11); *aðas sendan* (*Chr.*, 147, F, 7); *aðum benemnan* (*Beow.*, 1098); *að syllan* (*Luke*, I, 73).

Æ wesan is an expression of command and hence is followed by the subjunctive, as *CP.*, 219, 13, is æ þæt mon *hæbbe* lufe.

Æteowian, as an expression of admonition, is followed by the subjunctive, as *Luke*, III, 7, hwa ætywde eow þæt ge *fleon* from þam towerdan yrre?

Arædan, bearing reference to some contemplated action, is followed by the construction with *sculan* in *Bede*, 254, 22, aræddon þæt se abbod his latteow beon *scolde*.

Bena wesan, a poetical expression of petition is followed by the periphrasis with *motan* in *Beow.*, 364, hi benan synd þæt hi wiþ ðe *motan* wordum wrixlan.

Beornan on mode, indicating intense desire, is followed by the subjunctive in *AH.*, I, 17, bearn me on mode þæt ic þas boc of Ledenum spræce to Engliscre spræce *awende*.

Beotian, like *gehatan*, is followed either by the subjunctive or by the construction with *willan;* as *Exile's Complaint* (*Cod. Ex.*, 442, 32), ful oft we gebeotedan þæt unc ne *gesælde* nemne deaþ ana; *BH.*, 95, 3, beotaþ he þæt he *wile* þa sawla sendan on ece wita; *Or.*, 72, 29, 30; 144, 33.

Bewerian is mostly followed by the periphrastic construction with *motan*, as *Bede*, 78, 6, ne sceal heo bewered beon þæt heo *mote* in circan gongan; 76, 17; 222, 18; seldom by the inflected infinitive, as *Bede*, 80, 7, seo æ monig þing bewereð *to etanne*. A few instances are found of the sequence with the simple infinitive, probably under Latin influence, as *Bede*, 78, 31, ne sceal him bewered beon geryne *onfon* [mysterium percipere debet *prohiberi*].

Bicnian serves as a verb of petition in *Luke*, II, 7, and is followed by the subjunctive: hi bicnodon hyra geferan þæt hi *comen*.

Bysn sellan, as an expression of counsel or command, is generally followed by the construction with *sculan*, as *AH.*, II, 230, 15, he sealde soðe bysne þæt hi *sceoldon* forswerian heora unðeawas; similarly 232, 13. A similar construction follows *bysn astellan: AH.*, II, 40, 23; *BH.*, 33, 21; and *gebysnunga settan*, *AH.*, II, 242, 27. When an actual occurrence is described, the indicative is found in the indirect sentence, as *AH.*, II, 116, 14, is geseald bysen þæt þa unsprecendan cild *beoð gehealdene* on fulluhte.

Clypian requires the subjunctive in the dependent clause; as *AH.*, I, 452, 33, utan clypian to þære Godes meder þæt

heo us to hire Bearne *geðingige;* 70, 27; 254, 17; *LS.*, 98, 150; 184, 270; 390, 114; 408, 400; 452, 169; *AH.*, II, 70, 9.

Cneow bugan, a figurative expression of petition, is followed by the subjunctive in *AH.*, 408, 18, ic bige mine cneow þæt ge *beon gewyrtrumode.*

Deman, expressing command, is followed either by the simple subjunctive, as *Bede*, 476, 24, he gedemed hæfde þætte Ceolwulf æfter him cyning *wære;* or by the periphrasis with *sculan*, as *AH.*, I, 24, 25.

Fæstnunga sellan is followed by the construction with *willan* in *LS.*, 500, 211, þa sealdon hi heom fæstnunga betweonum þæt hi ealle þis *woldon* healdian.

Forgiefan is usually followed by the periphrastic expressions with *motan* and *magan;* as *Bede*, 56, 18, þæt he him forgeafe þæt he *moste* þone wæstm heora gewinnes geseon; similarly *AH.*, II, 48, 2; *Cr.*, 391; *Bede*, 84, 25; *LS.*, 346, 142, he forgeaf his apostolum þæt hi *mihton* gehælan; similarly 346, 142; 458, 282; *AH.*, II, 286, 27. It is rarely followed by the simple subjunctive, as *Jul.*, 729; or by *sculan*, *Ph.*, 377; *AH.*, II, 48, 11. Occasionally the indicative is employed, when attention is directed to the result of the action, as *Ph.*, 175, Hafað þæm treow forgiefen þæt he ana *is* beorhtast geblowen; *LS.*, 460, 297.

Gebann settan is followed by the subjunctive, as *AH.*, I, 30, 1, sette geban þæt *wære* on gewritum asett eall ymbhwyrft; *LS.*, 192, 396. The construction with *motan* is also found, as *LS.*, 96, 107.

Gescrifan requires the construction with *sculan* in *El.*, 1047, wyrd gescreaf þæt he swa geleafful in woroldrice weorðan *sceolde.*

Gesettan is followed by the subjunctive in *BH.*, 193, 3, hie þæt gesetton þæt he on witnunge stowe swa lange swungen *wære;* similarly *Or.*, 30, 34. The periphrasis with *sculan* is also found, as *AH.*, I, 150, 26; *Bede*, 448, 12; *Or.*, 164, 15. Like constructions with the subjunctive follow the related

expressions, *gesettan þone canon*, *AH.*, II, 94, 29, and *stent gesetnys*, *AH.*, II, 50, 20.

Gesprecan and *Gestihtian*, denoting agreement or determination, require the strengthened construction with *willan;* as *Or.*, 138, 3, hi him betweoxum gespræcon þæt hi *woldon* on Romane winnan; 264, 19; *Bede*, 112, 33, gestihtedon þæt heo *woldon* þære wisan ende gebidan.

Getemian (permit) is followed by *sculan* in *LS.*, 538, 809, þu ne mihtest getemian þæt mire andetnysse leoht-fæt *sceolde* acwyncan.

Geþafian is followed most consistently by the subjunctive; as *BH.*, 45, 11, þæt hie ne geþafien þæt hi heora lif on woh *lifgean;* *AH.*, I, 168, 6; *LS.*, 324, 72; 348, 169; 376, 179; *Bede*, 374, 5; *W.*, 22, 19; *AH.*, II, 40, 34; *An.*, 402. Occasionally, however, auxiliary constructions are found, with *motan:* *W.*, 85, 17; 96, 15; with *sculan:* *AH.*, II, 234, 27; 508, 25.

Geunnan is generally followed by the construction with *motan;* as *Beow*, 961, uðe ic swiðor þæt þu hine sylfne geseon *moste;* *W.*, 142, 23; 181, 32; 289, 24; *AH.*, II, 128, 10; 152, 18; *Gu.*, 902; *Byr.*, 175. The subjunctive is also met with; as *Chr.*, 219, D, 19, God him geunne þæt his goddæda swyðran *weorðen;* 217, D, 16. Occasionally the indicative is found in the dependent sentence expressing the resulting state; as *Beow.*, 1662, me geuðe yldra waldend þæt ic on wæge *geseah* wlitig hangian eald sweord-eacen; *AH.*, II, 594, 15; *Beow.*, 2875.

Gyrnan, expressing intense desire, is followed by the simple subjunctive, as *Ph.*, 462, glædmod gyrneð þæt he godra mæst dæda *gefremme;* *Matt.*, XXIII, 8; *Luke*, XXII, 31,—or by the periphrasis with *motan:* *AH.*, I, 142, 23, ne gyrnde na þæt he *moste* Crist gehyran sprecan; similarly *Chr.*, 53, E, 7; 317, F, 20,—or by that with *sculan:* *Chr.*, 92, E, 19, he geornde æt se kyning þæt he *scolde* from his mynstre; 52, E, 41; 53, E, 31.

Hæs requires *sculan* in the dependent clause in *AH.*, I, 402, 23, him com to Godes hæs þæt hi *sceolden* from stowe faran.

Healsian is very consistently followed by the subjunctive; as *CP.*, 137, 17, ic eow halsige þæt ge *feden* Godes heorde; *Or.*, 178, 14; *LS.*, 148, 24; *AH.*, I, 422, 20; 426, 31; *BH.*, 189, 7; *Bede*, 372, 7; *Gu.*, 1176; *AH.*, II, 248, 17; 490, 30; *Cr.*, 23. There are occasional examples of the periphrasis with *sculan*, as *AH.*, II, 146, 12. *Healsian*, like *biddan*, serves as an introductory to a direct petition, as *Descent into Hell*, 118, ic halsige þe, oferwurpe mid þy wætre ealle burgwaran.

Hryman, as a verb of petition, is followed by the subjunctive; as *AH.*, I, 156, 22, we sceolon hryman to þæm hælende þæt he *todræfe* þa yfelan costnunga from urum heortum.

Læran and *Laðian*, expressing incitement to an action, are followed by the subjunctive, as *Bede*, 44, 18, lærdon þæt hi fæsten *worhten;* 44, 34; *Jul.*, 149; *Ælfric de Novo Test.*, 21, 29, þu woldest me laðian þæt ic swiðe *drunce.*

Lyfan. The indirect sentence is often used as the logical subject introduced by *hit is* or *wæs alyfed;* as *AH.*, I, 142, 6; 522, 12. Elsewhere it is the object of *lyfan.* The simple subjunctive is very frequent in the dependent clause; as *Matt.*, XXII, 17, is hit alyfed þæt man casere gafol *sylle?; Mark*, X, 4; *John*, V, 10; *BH.*, 189, 22; *W.*, 285, 28; *AH.*, II, 94, 25; 100, 13. There is, however, a great fondness for the use of the periphrasis with *motan;* as *Gen.*, 2518, lyfað me þæt we aldornesse on sigor up secan *moten; Ph.*, 667; *Bede*, 400, 2; *W.*, 218, 17; 285, 5; *AH.*, II, 216, 11; *Gu.*, 380. There are sporadic instances of the inflected infinitive; as *AH.*, II, 348, 24, is alyfed to lybbenne; 520, 16. Similar constructions follow the related expressions, *leafnesse syllan*, *Bede*, 60, 14; 460, 25; and *lyfnesse forgyfan*, *Bede*, 328, 34.

Manian is almost without exception followed by the subjunctive. In the *Cura Past.* it occurs seldom except in the form *is to manianne*, employed very frequently as an introductory expression to the chapters on duties; as 191, 12, eac sint to manianne þa underþioddan þæt hie huru hie selfe *gehealden; W.*, 225, 13, þonne manaþ us þis halige gewrit þæt we simle *sion* gemynegode; similarly *LS.*, 496, 146; *Seaf.*,

36; *Bede*, 210, 15. In *Seaf.*, 50, we note the rare sequence with the infinitive: gemonaþ modes fusne *feran* to siðe. The related noun *monung* is likewise followed by the subjunctive, as *Bede*, 350, 1.

Mynegian regularly requires the subjunctive in the dependent sentence; as *AH.*, I, 56, 20, þa yfelan we mynegiaþ þæt hi from heora yfelnessum hrædlice *gecyrren;* 88, 22; 262, 12; *W.*, 171, 16; *AH.*, II, 492, 18. When the verb refers to an actual occurrence with the meaning 'to mention,' it is followed by the indicative, as *Bede*, 44, 7, þe we gemynegode þæt Severus *het* þwyrs gedician.

Myntan is followed by the subjunctive, as *Gen.*, 2182, fæste mynteþ þæt me æfter *sie* eaforan sine grefeweardas; or by the simple infinitive, as *Cr.*, 1058, se ðe gode mynteþ *bringan* beorhtne wlite.

Neadian (urge) is followed by the construction with *sculan* in *Bede*, 262, 1, nedde him þæt he ridan *sceolde.*

Onbœrnan (encourage) requires the usual subjunctive; *Bede*, 146, 10, wæs onbærnende þæt heo in þæm geleafan soðfæstnisse fæstlice *astoden.*

Tœcan, in its admonitory sense, is followed by the subjunctive, as *AH.*, II, 68, 2; or by the construction with *sculan*, as *AH.*, I, 372, 31.

Tican is generally followed by the subjunctive, as *LS.*, 98, 130, ic þe tihte þæt þu þam godum *geoffrige;* 134, 294; 162, 249; 204, 149. Occasionally the periphrasis with *sculan* is found, as *LS.*, 144, 435.

Tiþian with the subjunctive: *AH.*, II, 600, 1, getyða us þæt se ylca wisdom ure heortan ma *onbryde;* 172, 33; *LS.*, 444, 40, 66. Occasionally followed by *motan*, as *AH.*, II, 600, 7. In *LS.*, 298, 204, the subjects of both clauses are the same and *willan* is used: him tiðode God þæt he *wolde* hi fordon.

Geþingian, regularly with the subjunctive, as *Cr.*, 342, geþinga us þæt he us ne *lœte.*

Warnian, expressing in general advice against a certain course of action, is followed by the subjunctive, as *LS.*, 160, 211, het hine warnian þæt ne *nære* on þam mynstre nefre eft gesewen; 184, 255; *AH.*, I, 120, 16; II, 34, 33; 536, 5; 602, 24; *Gen.*, 527. When the indirect expression simply relates the danger against which the advice is directed, the indicative is used, as *Chr.*, 262, C, 24, þa gewarnode man þæt þær *wæs* fyrd gegaderod æt Sundene.

Wedd, as an expression of command, requires the subjunctive, as *AH.*, I, 90, 28, þis is min wedd þæt ælc hyse-cild *bco ymb-sniden*. *To wedde syllan*, as a promise, is followed by *willan*, as *Bede*, 124, 4.

Wyscan is followed by the subjunctive, as *Deor.*, 25, wyscte þæt þæs cynerices ofercumen *wære;* or by *sculan*, as *AH.*, II, 310, 4.

B. Verbs of Thinking, Believing, etc.

In this class are included verbs that express simple supposition, as *wenan*, *þencan*, *þyncan;* those that express thought directed to the accomplishment of an action, as *smeagan* and *hogian;* verbs of belief or trust, as *geliefan*, *truwian;* of doubt, uncertainty, and the like, as *tweogan*, *hopian*, etc. In these expressions the moment of subjectivity is always present in full force, and the subjunctive or its equivalent is regularly found.

Wenan.

Of all verbs introducing Indirect Discourse *wenan* is the most consistent in requiring the subjunctive of the dependent verb. I attribute this to the fact, that in these expressions the event or action contained in the dependent clause is not considered to take place at all, and its existence is merely a conjecture in the mind of the speaker or writer; it is conceived, therefore, from a wholly subjective view-point and is

expressed by the ordinary mood of subjective conception—the subjunctive. *CP.*, 209, 10, hie wenaþ þæt þæt *sie* þæt beste; *AH.*, I, 124, 14, sume men wenaþ þæt him *genihtsumige* to fulfremedum læcedome; *Or.*, 150, 26, þa wende man þæt þæt gewinn geended *wære*.

There are occasional examples of the use of the indicative, and it is a matter of some difficulty to explain these few anomalous constructions as opposed to the vast array of subjunctive forms. The most plausible explanation of these forms is as follows: accepting the subjunctive as the mood of subjective reflection, it is at least supposable that the reality of the event conceived would be more emphasized when this conception is in the mind of the speaker himself or of the person directly addressed, than when reference is made to the thought of a third person; hence, if the moment of objectivity enter at all, we should expect it to be present when *wenan* is used in the first or the second person; and, in truth, it is only after these forms that the indicative is found in the dependent sentence. Furthermore, owing to the frequency of their employment, *ic wene* and *wenst þu* (or *wenstu*) have apparently suffered a weakening of their original signification. Some examples may be given; as *AH.*, I, 580, 26, ic wene þæt þas word ne *sind* eow full cuðe; 378, 4, ic wene wit *sind* oferswiðde; here the omission of the conjunction and consequent breaking of connection favors the use of the indicative; *Boe.*, 146, 29, wenst þu nu þætte ealle þa þing for ði gode *sind* þy hi habbaþ; 16, 27, gif þu wenst þæt þære eorðan wæstmas þine *synd; AH.*, I, 396, 5, wenst þu þæt hi *beoþ* asyndrode from þam dome?. The distinction given above is well illustrated by the following example in *Boe.*, 86, 9, wenst þu þæt þa dysiende *wenaþ* þætte þæt þing *sie* ælces weorðscipes betst wyrðe? In *Boe.*, 44, 15, ic wat þæt ge wenaþ þæt ge nan god ne gesælþa *habbaþ*, the presence of *witan* probably contributes to the use of the indicative.

For the most part, however, *wenan* in these persons retains its usual sequence of the subjunctive, as *CP.*, 459, 10, hwa

wenstu þæt *sie* to þæm getreow?; *AH.*, I, 424, 29; *Or.*, 58, 28. Indeed, the requirement of the subjunctive by *wenan* is so strong that even in close renderings of a Latin original, the indicative in the Latin has no effect upon the Anglo-Saxon mood, as *John*, XIII, 29, wendon þæt se hælend hit *cwæde* be him [putabant quia *dicit* ei iesus].

Owing to the almost universal employment of the subjunctive, the auxiliaries *sculan* and *willan* seem to make a near approach to the expression of the future idea after *wenan*. The sense of duty or obligation is, however, still present in *sculan*, as *Ælfric de Novo Test.*, 17, 11, wende þæt he *sceolde* þurhwunian on gastlicum þeawum; *BH.*, 183, 31, wenstu þæt ic *sceole* sprecan to þissum men?; *CP.*, 281, 14, hwylc wite wene we þæt se fela sprecea *scyle* habban? Determined future action is thus expressed in *W.*, 244, 1. As usual after verbs of thinking, it denotes the result of the efforts of the designer [Lüttgens, p. 19], as *Or.*, 244, 11, þæt he sume hwile wende þæt hine mon *gefon sceolde;* 112, 10; 160, 29; 190, 4; *AH.*, I, 594, 10.

The future idea is much more truly expressed by *willan*, as *AH.*, I, 480, 1, wende þæt hi *woldon* his cynedom forseon; *CP.*, 201, 1, swelce he wene þæt his hlaford deman *wolde; Or.*, 196, 6; *AH.*, I, 334, 17; II, 582, 24; *LS.*, 426, 181; *Chr.*, 278, C, 10; 300, C, 17. In such cases as *CP.*, 113, 25, hu micele wenstu þæt hit *wolde* gif þær wlence and se anweald wære gemenged, *willan* gives a more distinct expression to the action indicated than would be done by the simple verb [Lüttgens, p. 25].

The omission of the conjunction after *wenan* does not as a rule affect the verb of the indirect clause: *Boe.*, 98, 23, wenst þu *mæge* his rice hine þær on lande wyrðne gedon?; similarly 40, 31; *John*, XXI, 25; *BH.*, 85, 16.

There are sporadic instances of the A.-S. subject-accusative construction after *wenan*, as *AH.*, I, 590, 25, þæt þu wenst *me* for tintregum ðа *geopenian* ðа godcundan gerynu; *Beow.*, 933, þæt ic ænigra *me* weana ne wende *gebidan; Bede*, 430,

24. The simple infinitive also occurs in *Beow.*, 2240, wende þæs *yldan.*

The constructions after *wenan* are thus tabulated:—

	CP.	*Or.*	*Boe.*	*Bede.*	*Chr.*	*BH.*	*LS.*	*AH.*	*W.*	*Gosp.*
Subj.....	53	11	20	1	1	8	10	22	8	10
Ind.....	0	0	4	3	0	1	0	4	1	0
Sculan.....	4	4	1	3	1	1	1	2	1	1
Willan.....	2	10	3	4	3	3	4	5	0	0

The related substantive *wen* is precisely similar, in the constructions that follow it; together with the verb "to be" it has the general meaning of 'perhaps' [Latin *forsitan*, see *John*, VIII, 19]: *AH.*, I, 580, 5, wen is þæt eower sum *cweðe* to him sylfum; similarly *CP.*, 93, 19; *BH.*, 231, 23; 243, 19; *Bede*, 408, 26; 414, 18; *Beow.*, 1846; *W.*, 140, 14; *LS.*, 376, 187.

Gelyfan.

The indirect sentence after *gelyfan* displays a marked variation in mood. All shades of expression seem present in this verb, from the pure subjectivity of mere conjecture to the objective statement of a universal truth. There is, therefore, observable a great diversity in the constructions following it, and, what is more, these constructions vary to a considerable extent with the writer.

In *Cura Past.* there is a steady adherence to the subjunctive, as 111, 11, he gelief*ð* þæt he *sie* swelc; 379, 10, etc. In the one example of the use of the indicative the statement is set forth in a strong, objective manner: 413, 32, hie sint to manianne þæt hie gelefen and baldlice getruwien þæt hi *ða* forgiefnesse *habbað* for þære hreowsunge. Ælfric, on the other hand, employs the indicative quite frequently in the subordinate clause, and it is well-nigh impossible to draw any hard and fast lines of distinction between the moods; the use of the indicative appears to be occasioned simply by the desire of the

writer to set forth one statement more objectively than another, as will be seen by comparing the two following examples: *AH.*, I, 214, 12, we gelyfaþ þæt we *beon* gehealdene þurh Cristes gife, and 292, 25, we sceolon gelyfan þæt ælces mannes sawul *biþ* þurh God gesceapen. Variation in mood is often found after the same introductory word, as *AH.*, I, 284, 15, swa þæt he secge oððe gelyfe þæt twy Godas *syndon* oððe ænig had on þære halgan þrynnysse *sy* unmihtigra þonne oðer.

The following observations may, however, be accepted as indicating the chief distinctions in the use of moods after *gelyfan*. The subjunctive finds its proper place in expressions of a purely subjective character, as in the following pious confession, *El.*, 795, ic gelyfe þe sel þæt he *sie* sawla nergeridi; it is found when the statement contains the moment of uncertainty, either in past or in present time, as *AH.*, I, 226, 19, gelyfdon hi þæt he oferswiðed *wære;* 344, 1, we gelyfaþ þæt of mancynne swa micel getel *astige* swa; it is very frequent also when a negative or conditional idea is present in the expression or when an indefinite future action is implied, as *BH.*, 153, 18, ne gelyfeð on Hælend Crist þæt he *sy* Godes Sunu; likewise *LS.*, 458, 275; *BH.*, 37, 16; *Cr.*, 656, 753; *John*, IX, 18; *Bede*, 396, 24, cwæð þæt he gelefde þæt gif he his handa hiene on sette, þætte him sona wel *wære;* similarly *AH.*, I, 590, 27; *BH.*, 151, 29; *W.*, 220, 2; *Bede*, 392, 10, gelefde þæt hire sona wel *wære; Dan.*, 447, 578. It is sometimes due to a certain assumption made in the statement, as *Chr.*, 294, C, 11, nu is to gelyfenne þæt hi *blissien* bliðe mid Criste þe wæron buton scylde acwealde. It is found also after a final clause, as *John*, VI, 30, and when the content of the subordinate clause is supposed to be false, as *John*, IX, 18.

The indicative is quite regularly employed when mention is made of the established doctrines of religious belief, as *AH.*, I, 26, 8, þæt men mihton gelyfan þæt he *wæs* Godes Bearn; 198, 14; 228, 20; 230, 8; 234, 29; II, 422, 16; 426, 16. A very effective use is made of this distinction in mood in the following example: Ælfric [*Hom.*, I, 116, 15, 24] is contrasting the

doctrines of heretics with those of orthodox christians; in the former case the subjunctive is used, in the latter the indicative, sume gedwolmen gelyfdon þæt he God *wære*, gelyfdon þæt he soð cyning *wære* . . . we gelyfdon þæt he æfre God *wæs*, we gelyfdon þæt he *wæs* deadlic. The indicative is used to express an actual fact, as *AH.*, II, 366, 28, hig gelyfdon þæt þu me *sendest;* 204, 33; *Matt.*, IX, 28; *John*, X, 38; XI, 27, 42; XIV, 10; XVI, 27; XVII, 8, etc. I attribute the great use of this mood in the *Gospels* partially to the influence of the Latin, as *Mark*, XI, 24, gelyfað þæt ge hit *onfoð* [credite quia *accipietis*].

The construction with *sculan* is employed with reference to an event sure of fulfillment in the future, as *AH.*, I, 294, 1, we sceolon gelyfan þæt ælc lichama *sceal arisan;* *W.*, 126, 18, 20.

Willan is used with a personal subject and approaches very near the simple future expression, as *An.*, 1285, ic gelyfe to þe þæt þu me næfre *wille* anforlætan; similarly *CP.*, 5, 2; *LS.*, 454, 218.

The allied adjective *geleaflic* is generally followed by the subjunctive, as *AH.*, I, 446, 3, is geleaflic þæt seo eadige cwen oðre *oferstige;* likewise 518, 3.

Þencan and *Geþencan.*

As an introductory verb of indirect discourse *þencan* has in general two distinct meanings: (1) it expresses intent or design with also the element of volition; (2) 'to remember,' 'to recount.'

1. With the former meaning (that most frequently met with) the simple subjunctive is generally employed in the dependent clause, as *CP.*, 235, 9, þohte þæt he hine *ofsloge;* *Or.*, 92, 22; 188, 13; *Matt.*, VI, 27; *W.*, 284, 10; *CP.*, 119, 3. The idea of design is emphasized by the use of the auxiliary *willan*, as *AH.*, I, 196, 16, þohte þæt he *wolde* hi diglice forlætan; *John*, XI, 53.

The force of *þencan* is, however, at times much weakened, the idea of design is almost entirely eliminated, and the verb

conveys little more meaning than would be given by *wenan;* in these cases, *sculan* is generally used in the subordinate clause, expressing the fact that the contents of the subordinate clause are in subjective dependence [Lüttgens, p. 19]; as *CP.*, 55, 19, he þinceð þæt he *sciele* monig god weorc ðæron wyrcan; *Or.*, 166, 29; 200, 10; 216, 15; *Beow.*, 692, nænig heora þohte þæt he þanon *sceolde* eft eardlufan æfre gesecean. This is a near approach to the simple future.

The simple infinitive is occasionally found after *þencan;* as *Jud.*, 58, þohte þa beorhtan idese mid widle and mid womme *besmitan;* likewise *El.*, 297.

2. With reference to a past event *þencan* means 'to remember;' as applied to a present action, it may also be rendered 'to bear in mind, consider.' The mood of the dependent verb is the indicative, as *CP.*, 53, 17, is to geþencenne þæt he *underfeng* martyrdom; *Matt.*, v, 23, þu þær geðencest þæt þinbroðor *hæfð* ænig þing agen þe; *CP.*, 55, 20; *Deor.*, 31; *W.*, 246, 7; 291, 14; *Boe.*, 62, 27. The subjunctive in *Boe.*, 134, 20, is owing to the occurrence of the verb in the protasis of an ideal condition. The transition to direct expression is easy and is occasionally found, as *BH.*, 51, 17, hurn ne magon we geðencan þæt seo eorðe *is* Godes and Godes *is* þæt yrfe, and we ealle *syndon* his, etc.

Beþencan has generally the meaning 'to remember, consider,' and hence is followed by the indicative, as *Cr.*, 821, scyle gehwilc beþencan þæt us milde *becwom* meahta waldend æt ærestan. The moment of design is occasionally present, and the subjunctive is used, as, *Nicod.*, 20 (*B–T.*), hig beþohton þæt hig hym seofon weras *gecuron; Jul.*, 155.

Þyncan.

The reality of the statement introduced by *þyncan* is dependent only upon the opinion of the object of *þyncan;* hence the verb of the dependent clause is usually in the subjunctive, as *Gen.*, 169, ne þuhte þa gerysne rodora wearde þæt Adam leng

swa *wære; CP.*, 85, 26, oðrum monnum þyncð þæt hie mæste scande *ðrowigen;* 113, 10; 115, 19; 203, 14, 20; 231, 20; 241, 4; 285, 4; 293, 6; 321, 24; 415, 31, 34; *Or.*, 246, 25; *AH.*, I, 236, 11; II, 160, 18; *Bede*, 430, 12; *W.*, 49, 7; 79, 11; 184, 18; *Dan.*, 498, 505; *Boe.*, 66, 2; 72, 18; 96, 29; 202, 18; *Matt.*, XXV, 29; *John*, VIII, 53.

There is the usual occurrence in the dependent clause of the modal auxiliaries with the exception of *willan;* as *Or.*, 84, 12, se þe him ær geþuhte þæt him nan sæ wiðhabban ne *mehte;* 98, 2; 118, 17; *CP.*, 57, 6, swa þincð him þæt he hie him niedscylde *sceolde* se þe hie him sealde. The mood of these auxiliaries varies, as *Boe.*, 76, 13, þæt me nu þincð þæt no þæt an þas onwyrð aræfnan *mæg;* 124, 4, him þincð þæt he ne *mæge* ðone welan gehealdan.

There are a few instances of the indicative in the dependent clause; in most cases the truth of the statement thus made is regarded as beyond doubt, and the usual subjective signification of *þincan* is decidedly weakened; as *Ælfric's Pref. Gen.*, 22, 8, nu þincð me þæt þæt weorc *is* swiðe pleolic me oððe ænigum men to underbeginenne. The greater or less degree of reality probably causes the difference in mood in the two following almost contiguous passages: *Boe.*, 164, 12, me þincð þæt þu me *dwelige* and *dyserie*,—16, me þincð þæt þu me *hwurfest* sum sunderlice spræce. The indicative is also found occasionally in a dependent clause which is separated from *þyncan* by a preceding clause, as *CP.*, 85, 26, oðrum monnum ðyncð þæt hie mæstne demm *ðrowigen* and hie forswencte *bioð* for worulde; similarly *AH.*, I, 48, 35.

Swelce is occasionally employed instead of the usual *þæt*, as *LS.*, 304, 300, þincð him arleasum *swylce* hi æfre motan libban; *W.*, 148, 12; *LS.*, 436, 65.

Gyman, expressing designed action, is followed by the subjunctive, as *Bede*, 346, 16, eornestlice gemde þæt he men from heora synnum *atuge; AH.*, II, 34, 32.

Gehihtan (to hope), with the subjunctive, as *Bede*, 404, 22, wæs gehihtende þæt he his lichamon *tolesed wære.*

Gehogian has the regular sequence with the subjunctive, as *AH.*, I, 484, 6, we sceolon hogian þæt we simle ðone maran gylt *forfleon;* 528, 4; *Gen.*, 2892; *Dan.*, 218; *Beow.*, 633; *AH.*, II, 558, 18. *Willan* is sometimes found when the personal intention is prominently set forth, as *Dan.*, 687, þæt gehogode Meda aldor þæt he Babilone abrecan *wolde; Bede*, 234, 25.

Hopian has a like construction, as *Luke*, XXIII, 8, he hopede þæt he *gesawe* sum tacen; *AH.*, II, 416, 14; *Luke*, XXIV, 21. There is liberal use made of the auxiliary forms, especially *willan*, as *LS.*, 314, 111, ic hopige on Drihten þæt he me ungederodne *wylle* ahreddan. *Sculan* as almost simple representative of the subjunctive but with a future force, as *W.*, 152, 20, hopode þæt heo gehyran *sceolde* hyre suna stemne. *Motan* is also met with, as *W.*, 147, 23.—The related noun, *tohopa*, has a similar regimen, as *Or.*, 104, 28, to þam tohopan þæt hie sume siðe God þanon *adoo* to heora agnum lande; *AH.*, I, 568, 8.

Hycgan is very consistently followed by the subjunctive, as *Gen.*, 397, We þæs sculon hycgan þæt we on Adame sume andan *gebetan*. Likewise *ahycgan*, *Gen.*, 2031, and *gehycgan*, *Cd.*, 217 (*B-T.*); the latter is also followed by *willan*, *Bt. Met.*, 19, 34, and by *magan*, *Gen.*, 562.

Lætan (suppose) has the regular subjunctive, but is peculiar in the employment of *swilce* instead of the usual *þæt*, as *LS.*, 514, 439, hi leton *swilce* hi on æfen *slepon;* 526, 634. The conjunction *þæt* is, however, sometimes found.

Ondrædan. The idea of volition is present in *ondrædan*, in that the will is directed not to the fulfillment but rather to the non-fulfillment of the action contained in the indirect clause. There is, therefore, almost exclusive employment of the subjunctive or of the auxiliary constructions; as *CP.*, 49, 19, oðer ondred þæt he *forlure* ða gestidon, oðer ondred þæt he *ongeate* on his swygean; 107, 17; *Or.*, 144, 16; *BH.*, 41, 21; *Bede*, 294, 26; 410, 28; *AH.*, II, 122, 27; 132, 3; *Bede*, 190, 15, ongan ondrædan þæt he to helle locum gelæded beon

sceolde; similarly 350, 14; 354, 29; *Or.*, 78, 14, ondredon þæt mon þa brycge forwyrcan *wolde;* likewise 150, 9. One instance of the indicative occurs, *AH.*, II, 70, 14, we ondrædaþ us þæt ge þa foresædan getacnunga to gymleaste *doþ*, gif we eow swiðor be þam gereccaþ; this mood is probably due to the tendency, so often observed in logical conditions after verbs of present time, to use the mood and tense of direct discourse.

Orwena, with the subjunctive; *Gen.*, 2222, ic eom orwena þæt unc seo eðylstæf æfre *weorðe* gifeðe ætgædere.

Secan, usually with the subjunctive; as *John*, VII, 4, secð þæt hit ofen *sy; AH.*, II, 308, 9.

Smeagean is comparatively seldom used as introductory to the indirect declarative sentence. It is followed most commonly by the construction with *willan*, as *AH.*, I, 206, 19, smeadon þæt hi *woldon* ofslean þone Lazarum; *Matt.*, XXVI, 16; *John*, X, 13. The simple subjunctive is also found, as *Mark*, XII, 12, þa smeadon hi þæt hi *gefengen* hine. In *CP.*, 55, 21, we find the inflected infinitive: smeageaþ monig god weorc *to wyrcanne.* When *smeagean* has the meaning, 'to think,' 'consider,' it is followed by the indicative, as *AH.*, II, 96, 12, hwæt wille we furðor smeagan buton þæt se *hæfð* þa mede ðe he geearnaþ.

Spanan, usually with the subjunctive, as *Or.*, 146, 7, hine spon þæt he on Umenis unmyndlenga mid here *become.* Occasionally *willan* is employed when the wish or design is prominent, as *Bede*, 316, 22, gesponan þæt heo brucan *wolde* hys gesynscipes.

Teohhian, as an introductory word to indirect discourse, is frequently employed by *Boe.* and at times in *Cura Past.*, rarely elsewhere. The subjunctive generally follows, as *Boe.*, 84, 12, 13, he teohhaþ þæt him *sie* betst, þonne tihhaþ he þæt he *mæge* beon swiðe gesælig; 82, 9; 98, 32; *CP.*, 286, 2. *Sculan* is used in recording a future event in *Boe.*, 92, 26, and expresses the falseness of an idea in *CP.*, 302, 3, tiochhiaþ þæt þæt *scyle* beon for eaðmettum [tacere se æstimant ex humilitate].

Truwian when pointing to an undetermined or future event is followed by the subjunctive or by the auxiliary constructions,

as *AH.*, II, 310, 28, þæt he truwode on God þæt he *nære ascyred; Or.*, 72, 16, getruwedon þæt hie *sceolden* sige gefeohtan; similarly by *willan*, *CP.*, 57, 22; *Or.*, 148, 17; or by *magan* and *motan: CP.*, 447, 9; *Or.*, 76, 9; 86, 4; *Beow.*, 2954. When it is desired to express an actual state in an objective manner, the indicative is used, as *CP.*, 413, 32, þæt hi getruwien þæt hie þa forgiefnesse *habbaþ* for ðære hreowsunga; *AH.*, II, 24, 6; 428, 1. Expressions containing the related substantive *truwa* are generally followed by the subjunctive, as *AH.*, I, 378, 30, næfð nænne truwan to Ælmihtigan þæt he him *foresceawige; Ælfric de Novo Test.*, 17, 9, mid fullam truwan þæt he geleafful *wære.*

Tweogan, Twynan, Tweo, Twynung. As these are strong expressions of doubt and uncertainty, a consistent use of the subjunctive would be expected after them; in most cases, however, a negative idea is also present which not only eliminates the element of doubt, but changes the expression into a strong affirmation. Hence, the usual mood in the dependent clause is the indicative, as *CP.*, 47, 10, nys þæs nan tweo þæt þæt *bið* soð eaðmodnes; *Boe.*, 160, 11, ne mæg nænne man þæs tweogan þætte God *ricsað* ofer hi; *Bede*, 64, 10; *Boe.*, 178, 4; *Cr.*, 961. The periphrases with *sculan* and *willan* have little more than a simple future signification, as *BH.*, 83, 7, þæt nænigne tweogan ne þearf þæt se wyrd on þas ondweardan tid geweorþan *sceal;* 65, 8, nis nan tweo þæt he forgyfnesse syllan *nelle.* In some instances, however, even when the negative element is present, the original idea of uncertainty comes forward expressed by the use of the subjunctive, as *Boe.*, 164, 5, nænne man nu ne tweoþ þæt God *sy* swa mihtig; *AH.*, I, 160, 21; 610, 13; *Boe.*, 176, 15; 190, 8. One example is found of the accus. and infin. modelled after the Latin: *Bede*, 190, 21, ne twygeo ic *mec gelæded beon* [nec dubito me sapiendum esse].

C. Verbs of Direct Perception and Simple Introductory Expressions.

Of the introductory words of the third class there are two distinct divisions: (1) Verbs of Direct Perception; after these expressions the events recorded are displayed before the reader as simple, undeniable realities, the element of subjectivity is almost entirely excluded, and hence the indicative is the predominant mood in the dependent clause. (2) Introductory words to simple indirect narration of events; with these I have included expressions of custom, since the latter merely record events of frequent occurrence. Here also the objectivity of the statement is strongly felt and the indicative is the rule in the indirect sentence.

1. *Verbs of Direct Perception.*

In this class are included *witan, ongietan, geseon, gehieran, oncneowon, geacsian, sceawian,* and the like.

Witan.

This verb, expressing in general simple intellectual cognition, is followed very consistently by the indicative, as *CP.*, 149, 3, sceal se reccere witan þæt þa unðeawas *beoð* oft geliccette; 121, 2; 143, 1; 191, 5; 201, 17; 220, 16; 273, 21, 24; 355, 21; *Or.*, 58, 21; 74, 31; 242, 32; *LS.*, 4, 41; 166, 308; *AH.*, I, 96, 2; 198, 19; 284, 12, etc. The dependent clause has the function of subject after the expression *is to witanne*, as *CP.*, 157, 14, is to witanne þæt ærest *biþ* se woh ðurhðyrelod; 273, 3; *AH.*, I, 110, 6; *LS.*, 424, 155; *W.*, 201, 23.

Almost all occurrences of the subjunctive after *witan* are due to the presence of ideas of contingency and the like, that enter in to modify the expression; as, *e. g.*, the conditional

element, *CP.*, 30, 11, we witon þæt he *nære* eaðmod gif he underfenge ðone ealdordom; *El.*, 459, gif hi wiston ær þæt he Crist *wære* cyning on roderum; *Boe.*, 242, 6; *Luke*, XII, 39. It is likewise due to a concessive idea, as *CP.*, 199, 7, þeah hie witen þæt hie elles altæwe ne *sien; BH.*, 225, 7. The subjunctive is caused at times by the element of duty or obligation expressed in the dependent clause, as *CP.*, 273, 24, eac sculan weotan þa þe . . . . þæt hie hiera sorge ne *geiecen;* similarly *W.*, 120, 16; *Boe.*, 170, 8; *CP.*, 459, 6. The subjunctive in *LS.*, 520, 542, is due to the negative character of the statement, and in *CP.*, 385, 12, to the influence of the governing subjunctive construction with *oþ:* oþ þu wite þæt ðin spræc *hæbbe* ægðer ge ord ge ende. In *BH.*, 183, 18, a false claim is thus set off from a true statement: wite þu þæt ic *beo* Godes sunu; compare 17, wite þu þæt ic *eom* dry. In *Boe.*, 116, 3, we have a rare instance of the simple subjunctive of indirect statement following *witan:* we witon þæt he *sie* buton þonne ealle þa oðre cræftas. In the introductory expression *witan þeah* ('very probably') there is no conjunction and the following verb is in the subjunctive regularly after *þeah;* as *Boe.*, 100, 10, ic wat þeah þu *wene;* 224, 27.

Sculan is frequently met with in the subordinate clause—to express sure action in future time, as *Or.*, 80, 35, we witun þæt we ure agen lif forlætan *sceolon; CP.*, 395, 22; *LS.*, 84, 570; 164, 291; *W.*, 248, 4; *Gen.*, 708,—or obligation and necessity, as *W.*, 298, 2, nyte ge ful georne þæt ælc man *scel* hyran his hlaforde?; *AH.*, II, 608, 15; *Or.*, 96, 14.

Willan is generally used with a personal subject in the future sense, as *Or.*, 80, 20, wiste þæt hie *woldon* georn fulran beon þære wræce þonne oðere men; 78, 23; 288, 15; *Beow.*, 1832. It expresses customary action in *AH.*, II, 552, 31, ic wat þæt þu eart styrne mann and *wilt* niman þæt þu ær ne sealdest and *wilt* ripan þæt þu ær ne seowe.

It is worthy of observation that the omission of the conjunction is very frequent in complex indirect sentences after *witan*, and it is often difficult to determine when the clause is

to be regarded as direct and when as indirect discourse. All things tend to show that the subordinating power of *witan* is considerably weaker than that of verbs of saying and thinking, and that there is a constant tendency to use this verb as a simple introductory expression like the Modern English 'you know.'

The following irregular constructions are to be noted: The subject-accusative construction is occasionally found, as *Wid.*, 101, wisse goldhrodene *cwen* gife *brittian; An.*, 183, 941; *Bede*, 36, 17. There are a few instances of the use of the accusative of the substantive and of the predicative adjective, as *Seaf.*, 92, wat his inwine æðelinga *bearn* eorðan *forgiefene;* similarly *Bede*, 82, 12; *Gu.*, 976, 1059; *Rid.*, XXXVI, 3. In *BH.*, 191, 36, the following curious construction occurs: wite þu þæt *Neronem þysne wyrrestan cyning* æfter þara apostola cwale þæt he becom on hatunga; the accusative *Neronem* is due probably to its being regarded by the careless or ungrammatical writer as the object of *witan.*

The statistics for the constructions after *witan* are as follows:

	CP.	*Or.*	*Boe.*	*Bede.*	*BH.*	*W.*	*LS.*	*AH.*	*Gosp.*
Ind.	24	9	23	28	35	27	14	46	28
Subj.	5	0	5	0	7	7	3	0	1
Sculan	1	2	1	0	5	5	5	0	0
Willan	0	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	1

Ongietan.

This verb is in frequent use in all the works of the Alfredian period, especially in the *Boethius;* it is, however, more sparingly used in later Anglo-Saxon and least of all by Ælfric who employs mostly *oncnawan* and *undergietan. Ongietan,* like *witan,* expresses its statement in a purely objective manner and the indicative is predominant in the subordinate clause, as *CP.*, 101, 13, he ongeat þæt he *oferstag* hine sylfne; 109,

14; 113, 14; 115, 4; 165, 20; 181, 21; 213, 4; 321, 6; *Or.*, 222, 1; 268, 14; *Bede*, 440, 30; *BH.*, 67, 5; 109, 10; *Boe.*, XII, 4, etc.; *Gen.*, 1474; *Jud.*, 168; *Cr.*, 1160; *An.*, 899; *El.*, 289; *AH.*, II, 136, 33.

The subjunctive in the dependent clause is always due to the influence of moments of condition, concession, and the like, which enter into the expression, as *CP.*, 69, 20, gif þæt ondgiett ongiett þæt hit self dysig *sie;* similarly 49, 21. It is due to the imperative nature of the statement in *CP.*, 119, 12, and to the negative character of the sentence in *CP.*, 195, 15, ne mæg furðum ongietan þæt hit ænig yfel *sie.* In *Boe.*, 56, 7 and 150, 17, the dependent sentence is also an ideal or unreal condition. The subjunctive is also frequent in hypothetical and assumed expressions, as *CP.*, 379, 18, se þe ongiete þæt *sie* gecieged mid godcundre stemne; 151, 14, þæt hie ongieten þæt hie men *tæle;* 281, 11; 419, 34; 441, 13. It is to be noted that in these instances the governing verb is generally in the subjunctive mood and the influence of this mood upon the dependent clause is doubtless to be looked upon as contributing to the use of the subjunctive in the latter; as also in *CP.*, 159, 7, ðylæs þe hie *ongieten* þæt he *sie* onstyred; similarly 449, 25. The strong objective nature of *ongietan*, however, often preserves the indicative, even when one or more of these moments of contingency, condition, etc. enter, as *CP.*, 201, 16, gif hie ne ongietaþ þæt þa *beoþ* hira gelican. In *Boe.*, XII, 4, sæde he swytole ongieten hæfde þæt hit eal soð *wære*, and 156, 25, þu sædest þæt þu ongeate þætte God *weolde*, the subjunctive is really due to the indirect construction after *secgan.* Lastly, the interrogative nature of an expression frequently causes the use of the subjunctive, as *Boe.*, 208, 8, hwæðer þu ongite þæt ælc yfel-willende mon *sie* wites wyrðe?

Sculan has its well-known use as an exponent of duty, as *CP.*, 205, 10, þa he ongeat þæt hie mon mid sumum bisnum manian *sceolde* [cum trahendos cernet]; *Bede*, 188, 14. It is used in a prophetic sense in *Bede*, 198, 9, ic ongeote þæt he of þissum life leoran *sceal.*

Willan expresses little more than the simple future idea in *Boe.*, 66, 7; 76, 22; *BH.*, 135, 22. The original idea of volition is, however, seen, as in *CP.*, 457, 25, þa hie ongeaton þæt he gafol wiþ bæm friðe habban *wolde.*

The accus. and infin. is rarely met with and is an obvious imitation of the Latin, as *Bede*, 330, 15; 340, 14.

Undergietan is similar in meaning to *ongietan*, but is not so frequently used, for the most part only by later Anglo-Saxon writers, especially Ælfric. In its constructions it differs in no respect from the preceding verb; as *LS.*, 250, 207, þa undergeat he þæt se an *wæs getealdt* to þam cynehelmum; similarly *AH.*, I, 424, 33; 430, 12; II, 160, 12; 270, 9; *Chr.*, 270, C, 19.

Geseon.

The statement set forth by *geseon* possesses the full reality of direct perception and is expressed most consistently by the indicative, as *CP.*, 447, 32, þæt hi geseon þætte þis mannes lif swiðe hrædlice *gewit;* similarly *Or.*, 140, 22; 246, 29; *LS.*, 252, 218; *AH.*, I, 80, 12; 182, 4; 208, 3; *BH.*, 189, 5; *Bede*, 412, 28; *Byr.*, 203; *Boe.*, 94, 30.

The subjunctive is rarely found in the dependent clause. In *BH.*, 45, 8, ne sy eow nænigu cearu þæt ge geseon þæt þeos eadige Maria *sy* geceged to deaðe, the adhortative idea occasioning the subjunctive of *geseon* exercises its influence in the subordinate clause; similarly *Bede*, 438, 18. The subjunctive occurs also when *geseon* in the passive has the meaning 'seems,' corresponding to *videtur*, as *Bede*, 344, 23, þa wæs him eallum gesegen þæt him *wære* heofonlic gifu forgifen [visum est omnibus celestem ei concessam esse gratiam]; 396, 19.

Sculan expresses certain fulfillment in future time, as *AH.*, I, 534, 13, swa hi gesawon þæt he hrædlice gewitan *sceolde.* *Willan* retains its strong sense of volition in *AH.*, II, 302, 15, geseah þæt hi *noldon* heora synna behreowsian.

The subject-accusative construction is remarkably frequent after *geseon;* an action or event is in this way most vividly described as taking place immediately before our eyes; as *Bede*, 112, 7, heo þa gesegon *þone biscop mæssan mærsian* in Godes ciricean; *Gen.*, 2777, þæt wif geseah for Abrahame *Ismæl plegan; Bede*, 386, 8, he *us* sceawode and geseah in gewinne *gesette beon* [the Latin uses here the accus. with the infin.]. Similarly *John*, xx, 5, 6; *El.*, 243; *An.*, 847, 992, 1004, 1009, 1448, 1492, 1690; *Rid.*, xii, 1; *Wand.*, 46; *Cr.*, 498, 506, 511, 740, 925, 1154; *Dan.*, 726; *Gen.*, 669; *A H.*, ii, 272, 16; 468, 8; *W.*, 199, 13; *Bede*, 440, 21. This construction is thus seen to be a favorite one in the graphic language of Anglo-Saxon poetry; the Modern English equivalent is the present-participial construction.

Gehyran.

Gehyran, like *geseon*, is usually followed by the indicative in the dependent sentence, as *CP.*, 265, 24, hie sculon gehieran þæt on him *biþ* gefylled Salomones cwide; 357, 22; *LS.*, 254, 284; *AH.*, i, 220, 30; *BH.*, 161, 6; *Bede*, 370, 26.

The subjunctive is more frequently used than after *geseon;* besides its employment in expressions containing ideas of condition, concession, and the like, as *CP.*, 211, 19, it is very common after *gehyran* when this verb serves merely to introduce an indefinite statement, thus agreeing precisely with the usual subjunctive of reported statement after verbs of saying; as *Or.*, 138, 18, ic hierde þæt hi na *nære* on þam dagum mid Romanum buton gewinne; *Byr.*, 117; *Bede*, 190, 32, we geherdon þæt *wære* wundorlice halignesse cyning [audivimus quia fuerit rex mirandae sanctitatis]; in the last example the Latin subjunctive may have had some influence upon the Anglo-Saxon mood.

The construction with *sculan* in the sense of duty is found in *AH.*, ii, 544, 27, and in a prophetic sense in *BH.*, 5, 22.

Instances of the use of the infinitive after *gehyran* are few and confined mostly to the collocation *secgan hyrde, Beow.*, 1347; see also *Beow.*, 38, 582, 1843, 2024. There are a number of obvious imitations of the Latin accus. with infin. construction, as *Bede*, 310, 3, gehyrde Theodor *þone geleafan* þurh gedwolan swiðe *gedrefde beon* [audiens T. fidem per heresiam multum esse turbatam]; 232, 30, gehyrdon *heora biscop forð farendne and bebyrgedne* [cum ergo episcopum defunctum ac sepultum audirent]. The use of this construction for the purpose of vivid description is not so frequent as with *geseon: Cr.*, 797, gehyred rodora *dryhten sprecan reðe word;* similarly *El.*, 538.

On-, Ge-, and To- cnawan.

The indicative is almost exclusively used after these verbs, as *CP.*, 181, 16, we magon oncnawan þæt se eaðemodnesse lareow na ne *cwæð;* 181, 18; *AH.*, I, 128, 13; 372, 24; 426, 27; 466, 7; II, 60, 35; *Mark*, V, 30; *Luke*, I, 22; *LS.*, 392, 130; *Bede*, 114, 31; 330, 11; *An.*, 1517; *El.*, 807; *BH.*, 115, 19; it is specially frequent in *John's Gospel.*

The few forms of the subjunctive are due to external influences,—as, the final nature of the governing clause, *LS.*, 250, 193, þæt men oncnawon þæt we to þe *clypodon* and we *beon* gehealdene; *BH.*, 191, 27, þæt oncneowon þæt hie buton me *beon* þa þe habban; or the negative character of the expression, as *An.*, 714, soð ne oncneowon þæt hit drycræftum gedon *wære* scingelacum.

Tocnawan is not so generally employed as an introductory word as the other forms. Some examples of its use are *AH.*, I, 370, 16, þæt eal þeodscype tocnawe þæt swa hwa swa .... þæt him ne *bið* getid; 568, 23; *LS.*, 258, 342; 298, 216; *AH.*, II, 496, 9.

Behealdan is followed regularly by the indicative, as *AH.*, I, 84, 1, he beheold þæt God *gesihð* ure yfelnessa and ure

gyltas *forðgyldað*. The dependent clause frequently refers to a substantive object of the governing verb, as *AH.*, II, 446, 28, ne beheolde þu minne þeowan Job þæt nan man *nis* his gelica on eorðan; similarly 452, 14.

Cuð, *Sweotol*, and *Gesiene*, with the verbs *weorðan*, *beon*, or *don*, form strongly objective expressions and the indicative is used almost without exception in the dependent clause, as *Or.*, 158, 13, wearð Pirruse cuð þæt Agaðocles *wæs gefaren* on Sicilia þam londe; similarly *LS.*, 138, 327; *AH.*, I, 206, 13; *Boe.*, 84, 4; *Beow.*, 150; *BH.*, 167, 18; *CP.*, 153, 8, bið hit sweotol þæt se lacnigende *forlies*ð þone cræft; similarly *CP.*, 83, 20; *LS.*, 139, 327; *Boe.*, 80, 17; 98, 6; *Or.*, 252, 29, hit wæs eac gesyne þæt hit *wæs* Godes stihtung; *Beow.*, 3059. *Willan* is used in the subordinate clause in the sense of design, as *Or.*, 146, 13, wearð Macedonium cuð þæt Perdican broðor *wolden* winnan on hie. There are very few instances of the subjunctive sequence; as *Boe.*, 138, 19, caused by the interrogative nature of the expression: Hu ne wære hit genoh sweotol þæt hiora *nære* nauþer þæt oþer.

Geacsian, expressing the result of inquiry, sets this forth as an unquestioned fact; hence the indicative is the mood of the dependent clause. This verb is used as an introductory word almost wholly in Anglo-Saxon prose; only a few instances are found in the poetry. *Chr.*, 282, C, 15, þa se cyning geahsode þæt se here uppe *wæs; Or.*, 148, 16; 150, 11; 160, 1; 196, 9; 200, 11; 230, 4; 282, 7; *Bede*, 46, 12; 146, 5; 288, 30; *AH.*, II, 186, 2; *Beow.*, 433; *Ph.*, 393. *Willan* with a personal subject conveys the meaning of intention or design, as *Or.*, 80, 28, Leoniþa þæt þa geascade þæt hiene mon swa beþridian *wolde*. *Sculan* is used in the prophetic sense in *W.*, 197, 8. There is one example of the subject-accusative construction used for the purpose of vivid portrayal in the graphic style of Wulfstan: *W.*, 2, 1, we geacsedon his *geceasterwunan beon* godes englas and we geacsodon þæra engla *geferan beon* þa gastas soðfæstra manna.

Gefrignan is similar to the preceding verb both in sense and in sequence. This distinction is, however, to be noted: while *geacsian* is used mostly in Anglo-Saxon prose, *gefrignan* is a common poetic expression and acts as a favorite introduction to a poem [see *Beow.*, 2; *Ph.*, 1; *Dan.*, 1]. Examples of its use are *Cr.*, 201, we þæt gefrugnon þæt gefyrn be þe *sægde* sum wodbora; *Beow.*, 695, hie hæfdon gefrunen þæt ær to fela micles in þæm winsele waldend *fornam* Deniga leode.

With *gefrignan* there are numerous instances of the subject-accusative, as *Dan.*, 1, gefrægn ic *Hebreos* eadge *lifgan* in Hierusalem, goldhord *dælan*, cyningdom *habban; An.*, 1094, ic lungre gefrægn *leode* tosomne burgwaru *bannan; Beow.*, 1970, *geongne guðcyning godne* gefrunen hringas *dælan;* similarly 2485, 2695, 2753, 2774; *Cr.*, 78; *Jud.*, 7.

Geleornian contains in some degree the peculiarities of simple verbs of indirect discourse like *cweðan* and *secgan*, in that the true subjunctive of reported statement is frequently found in the subordinate clause, as *BH.*, 117, 25, we leorniaþ þæt seo tid *sie* to þæs dagol; 131, 15, swa we on Godes bocum leornodon þæt drihten selfa to his gingrum *cwæde; BH.*, 133, 36; *Bede*, 164, 21; 174, 4; *W.*, 20, 12; 123, 12; 127, 8. The objective force is, however, quite strong and the indicative is frequently found, as *BH.*, 125, 8, þonne leorniaþ we þæt seo stow *is* on Olivetes dune ufewearde; 125, 13; *Chr.*, 66, F, 10; *Bede*, 100, 26; *LS.*, 344, 124. The construction with *sculan* implying obligation is found in *Bede*, 76, 7, þu þæt geleornadest þætte *sceolde* heo ahabban from Godes huse 33 daga [debeat abstinere]; similarly 62, 21. There are a few examples of the subject-accusative, as *Bede*, 90, 15, þe he ær geara geo geleornade ealde *Romanisce weorce geworhte beon* [factam fuisse didicerat]; similarly *Bede*, 404, 21.

Gemettan is regularly followed by the indicative, as *John*, xi, 17, gemette þæt he *wæs* forðfaren. The subject-accusative after the model of the Latin is found in *Bede*, 246, 14, þa

gemetton heo *þone ærcebisceop geleoredne* of worulde [invenerunt *archiepiscopum migrasse* de saeculo].

Gewita beon, with the indicative, as *CP.*, 54, 2, he bið gewiota þæt he *wilnað* him selfum gilpes; similarly 379, 13. The same construction follows the phrase, *is to gewitnesse*, *CP.*, 165, 13; 451, 16; *AH.*, II, 492, 16; *Matt.*, XXIII, 31.

Onfindan, with the indicative, as *Wid.*, 131, ic þæt onfand þæt se *bið* leafast londbuendum; similarly *Or.*, 52, 6; 148, 7.

Sceawian, like *geseon*, is followed by the indicative, as *AH.*, I, 490, 1, sceawiað þæt nan stede *nis* ures lichaman; *El.*, 58. The dependent clause refers to a substantive object in *Luke*, XII, 24, Besceawiað þa *hrefnas* þæt hig ne *sawað*.

Understandan, as a simple expression of cognition, is followed by the indicative. It is of frequent occurrence in Wulfstan and also in the works of Ælfric, taking the place in great measure of *ongitan* and *oncnawan*, the usual expressions of Alfredian prose; as *W.*, 20, 6, understandað þæt ælc cristen man *ah* micle þearfe; 32, 6; 37, 6; 108, 2; 112, 14; 128, 1; 151, 27; 155, 1; *AH.*, II, 28, 27; 210, 3; 458, 10. The element of advice or injunction is frequently present in *understandan;* at such times it is followed by the subjunctive, as *W.*, 28, 12, understandað þæt ge æfre *habban* rihtlice geleafan on ænne ælmihtigne God; similarly 118, 5; 155, 3; 167, 11.

2. *Simple Introductory Expressions.*

In this class are included *gelimpan*, *gebyrian*, *beon*, *geweorþan*, *ðeaw* and *gewuna wesan*, and the like.

Gebyrian and *Gelimpan.*

Since the element of subjectivity does not enter into the expression, the indicative mood is the rule in the subordinate clause, as *AH.*, I, 30, 10, þa gelomp hit þæt hire tima *wæs* gefylled; *Boe.*, 54, 3; *LS.*, 264, 51; *Bede*, 226, 13; *El.*, 272; *AH.*, II, 142, 18; *W.*, 214, 16. The following distinction

between these two verbs may be noted: as the simple introduction to an indirect statement, *gebyrian* and *gelimpan* are both in frequent use at the time of Alfred; in later times, however, *gebyrian* was less and less used in this way, having now generally assumed the meaning of fitness, propriety, suitability, and its place as an introductory particle is taken by *gelimpan*. Taking *CP.* and *AH.* as representative works of these two periods, we find that *CP.* contains twenty-five examples of *gebyrian* to four of *gelimpan;* on the other hand, in *AH.* there are over forty instances of *gelimpan* while *gebyrian* in this sense is almost if not entirely wanting.

The subjunctive in the dependent clause is due to external influences, as *CP.*, 199, 13, ac gif hwæm gebyrige þæt he his hlaford *befoo;* 341, 1, ðylæs him gebyrige þæt hi *werðen; W.*, 273, 11, þeah þæt gelimpe þæt men sume hwile *syn* her on worulde; similarly *CP.*, 199, 22; *W.*, 227, 9; *El.*, 441. In *Boe.*, 112, 20, the dependent clause is an unreal conditional sentence: þæt hwilum gebyrede þæt him betere *wære* þæt he bearn næfde þonne he hæfde.

It appears that the subordinating force of *gelimpan* is comparatively weak; hence there is ready transition to direct discourse, as *LS.*, 488, 16, þa gelamp hit þæt he ferde into anre byrig and of þære byrig he for into Cartagine; þa he gefrunen, etc.; similarly 388, 69; *AH.*, II, 446, 24; *Bede*, 400, 26.

A curious mixture of the Anglo-Saxon and the Latin constructions is seen in *Bede*, 382, 11, þa gelamp *him* þurh reliquias Cudbryhtes *gehæledne beon* [contigit *eum* per Cudbereti reliquias *sanari*].

Geweorþan.

Geweorþan is a favorite introduction to an indirect statement; its stylistic value is apparent; it is used not only to vary a long succession of direct statements, but also serves to prepare the reader for a statement about to be made. The mood of the dependent clause is the indicative, as *W.*, 18, 8, hit gewearð ymb XL daga þæs þe he of deaðe aras þæt him *com* of heofonum

ongean mycel werod; *CP.*, 111, 25; 197, 14; *Or.*, 98, 30; 108, 4, 24; 160, 23; 248, 4; *Chr.*, 356, E, 9; *W.*, 66, 9; *Boe.*, 52, 26; *Mark*, II, 15. The perfect tenses, *is* or *wæs geworden*, denoting a resulting state in present or past time, form a frequent introduction, especially in the *Gospels;* as *W.*, 164, 15, is nu geworden þæt men *scamaþ* for godam dædan; *BH.*, 153, 27; 243, 3; *CP.*, 91, 26; *Bede*, 246, 31; 296, 25; 414, 12; *Or.*, 37; *Matt.*, IX, 10; *Luke*, XVI, 22.

The usual subjunctive is often found after conditional, concessive, and final clauses and the like, as *W.*, 169, 15, gif hit geweorþe þæt se þeodscype *becume* healic ungelimp for manna gewyrhtan; *W.*, 172, 16; *LS.*, 514, 456; *Boe.*, 50, 14; *W.*, 79, 18, 19; 162, 16; 309, 15. The subjunctive of command is seen in *LS.*, 504, 292. The periphrases with *sculan* and *willan* are frequent with their usual meanings, as *Or.*, 178, 7, hit gewearð þæt hie *wolden* to Romanum friðes wilnian; 226, 16.

The conjunction is at times omitted, just as was observed after *gelimpan;* this is specially the case when a subordinate clause precedes the main clause of the dependent expression, as *BH.*, 237, 30, wæs geworden, mid þy þe hie me sendon on þis carcern, ic bæd urne drihten, etc. This omission is very frequent in the *Gospels*, as *Matt.*, XI, 1; XIII, 53; *Luke*, I, 41; VIII, 2.

In a few cases *geweorþan* is used with a personal dative in the sense 'it pleases,' with a final idea; here the subjunctive is used in the dependent clause, as *LS.*, 412, 457, þa gewearð his þegnum þæt hi *acwealden* ['they agreed to kill him']; similarly *LS.*, 278, 232.

Beon and *Wesan.*

As simple introductory expressions these verbs are followed by the indicative, as *Bede*, 98, 13, þa wæs þætte Augustinus *gelaðelode* Bretta biscopas in þære stowe; *CP.*, 353, 17, wæs eac þætte Fines *forseah* his freondscipe; *Or.*, 56, 6; *Bede*, 98, 13; 196, 10; 202, 23; 204, 6; 338, 31; *W.*, 227, 4; *Beow.*, 1763.

With regard to its stylistic value the following peculiarity in the use of this verb is to be noted: When a long subordinate phrase or clause precedes the main clause in ordinary direct discourse, the principal statement loses considerable force by being placed at the end of the expression; it is seemingly to correct this, that reference to the main statement is made by *wesan* at the beginning of the sentence, and, after the intervention of the subordinate expression, the principal statement, already introduced, is made in indirect discourse; this use of *wesan* is specially frequent in *Bede;* as 170, 9, Ða wæs æfter noht manegum . . . . þæt Wine wæs adrifen of his biscopsetle; similarly 104, 12; 108, 21; 176, 8; 186, 23; 192, 25; *BH.*, 115, 29.

The subjunctive in the dependent clause is due to the same causes as after other verbs of this class, as *CP.*, 57, 8, hu mæg hit butan þam beom þætte þæt mod ne *sie* eft to gecerred; similarly *W.*, 283, 28.

þæt *is* or *wæs*.

The combination of þæt with the verb *wesan* is an interesting introductory expression, owing to the variety of its use and the peculiarities of the constructions following it.

This introductory phrase is used in four ways:

1. To explain or amplify a previous statement. The indicative is mostly used in the dependent clause, as *CP.*, 463, 33, þæt is þætte þæt mod, sona swa hit God forsihð, swa *secð* his agenne gielp; 293, 16; 301, 24; 355, 5; 377, 14; 389, 26; 433, 20; 463, 33; *Or.*, 74, 15; 78, 4; 128, 26; 254, 8; *BH.*, 9, 32; 11, 23; 223, 17; *Boe.*, 22, 2; 70, 28; *W.*, 93, 2; 176, 1. There are a few examples of the subjunctive in assumptions or indefinite statements, as *CP.*, 349, 13, þæt is þæt hwa *fare* mid his mode æfter his nihstan; or it is due to the influence of a preceding subjunctive, as *AH.*, II, 46, 1.

2. To introduce a command or admonition following upon a preceding statement; the periphrasis with *sculan* is here

generally employed, as *BH.*, 67, 32, wes þu behydig and gemyndig Marian þinga, þæt is þæt þu *scealt* on æghwilce tid Godes willan wercan; similarly 23, 9; *AH.*, II, 464, 30. The simple subjunctive is occasionally used, as *CP.*, 461, 11, þæt is þæt ælc lareow swiðor *lære* mid his weorcum; similarly 461, 18; *W.*, 102, 24.

3. This introductory phrase is inserted between the verb of saying and the dependent sentence for the purpose of directing special attention to the following statement; the construction in the indirect sentence follows the usual rules after verbs of saying, as *Boe.*, 6, 21, þæt þu me geo sædest, *þæt wæs*, þæt nan anweald *nære;* similarly 176, 19; 182, 15; 200, 11; *CP.*, 323, 14.

4. To express the Latin construction of two correlative infinitives the Anglo-Saxon employs two correlative dependent clauses introduced by *þæt is* and *þæt* respectively; the subjunctive is used in both clauses; as, *e. g.*, for the Latin, 'gladium super femur ponere est praedicationis studium voluptatibus carnis anteferre' the Anglo-Saxon writes, '*þæt is* þæt mon his sweord *doo* ofer his hype, *þæt* mon þa geornfulnesse his lare *læte* furður ðonne his flæsces lustas' [*CP.*, 383, 4]; similarly 285, 7; 315, 18; 329, 19; 367, 12; 383, 7, 10; 421, 11. Fleischhauer, in his work on the subjunctive in *CP.* [p. 38], gives the correct explanation of the use of the subjunctive in these constructions: "Die Anwendung dieser Redensarten findet in der Weise statt, dass durch den Subjektssatz der Inhalt des unmittelbar oder mittelbar vorhergehenden Satzes wiederholt und durch den Prädikatssatz näher erläutert wird, und zwar so, dass sowohl der Subjekts als auch der Prädikatssatz kein thatsächliches Ereigniss sondern nur einen angenommenen Fall enthält, woraus sich der Conjunctiv beider erklärt." A modification of this rather artificial construction is occasionally observable, in which the regular indicative is used, as *CP.*, 413, 27, Todælu wæteru we *lætaþ* ut of urum eagum ðonne we for synderlicum synnum synderlæca hreowsunga *doð;* 425, 22.

A somewhat similar construction is observed in Ælfric's writings, when the indirect clause introduced by *þæt is* serves to define and explain a preceding substantive; as *LS.*, 358, 314, an is temperantia þæt is þæt mon *beo* gemetegod and to mycel ne *ðiege;* 358, 321, 326; 360, 334. When the conjunction is omitted the indicative is found, as *LS.*, 356, 300, se seofoða leahter is jactantia gecweden, þæt is, þonne se mon *bið* lofgeorn and mid licetunge *færð*.

Gewuna and *þeaw*.

These words together with the verb 'to be' are employed as introductory expressions to statements of customary action. The indicative is generally found in the dependent clause, as *CP.*, 337, 18, manigra manna gewuna wæs þæt hie hie mid þissum wordum *ladiað* and *cweðað;* similarly 461, 1; *Or.*, 100, 8; 156, 21; 164, 34; *Bede*, 64, 12; 76, 28; 148, 24; 370, 25; *Boe.*, 52, 30; *AH.*, I, 600, 8; II, 366, 15; *Beow.*, 1247; *An.*, 177; *Mark*, XV, 6; *John*, XVIII, 39.

In some instances, however, it seems that the very vagueness implied in an habitual action finds its most appropriate expression in the subjunctive, as *Wand.*, 11, ic wat þæt bið in dryhten ðeaw þæt he his ferhðlucan fæste *binde; Mark*, XV, 6. The usual subjunctive of ideal condition is found in *AH.*, II, 454, 13.

The periphrasis with *sculan* is occasionally employed in the dependent sentence; the primitive signification of this construction was that the continuous observance of a certain course of action caused its further performance to be looked upon as an obligation to be fulfilled; this earlier meaning has in great measure disappeared and the auxiliary *sculan* is simply a relic of this former idea: *Or.*, 21, 10, þæt is mid Estum þeaw þæt þær *sceall* ælces geðeodes man beon forbærned: gif þar man an ban findeð unforbærned, hi hit *sceolon* miclum gebetan; similarly 70, 23; *AH.*, I, 218, 1. In Mark, XV, 6, the simple subjunctive is used in the indirect clause after the

abstract expression *wæs gewuna;* in the corresponding passage in *Luke*, the introductory expression has a personal subject, *hig hæfdon to gewunan*, and the duty imposed by this subject (the people) upon the magistrate is expressed by the use of *sculan* in the indirect clause: hig hæfdon to gewunan þæt se dema *sceolde* forgifan þam folce ænne forwyrhtne man [consuerat praeses dimittere].

Willan is also found in the dependent clause; though it had primarily the idea of volition, the meaning passed over to express a tendency toward a certain course of conduct and hence serves as a good expression of customary action [Lüttgens, p. 72]: *Or.*, 112, 19, heora gewuna wæs þæt hie *wolden* of ælcere byrig himself anweald habban; similarly *AH.*, II, 138, 3.

In *Bede*, 82, 1, the dependent clause and the infinitive are both employed, an obvious confusion with the Latin construction: wæs Romana gewuna þæt heo clænsunge bæðes and þweales sohton and fram cirican ingonge *ahebban* [R. usus fuit et lavari purificationem quaerere et ingressu ecclesiae *abstinere*].

The adjective *gewunelic* is followed by precisely similar constructions, as *AH.*, I, 40, 44; 60, 26; 478, 8; II, 228, 1. Likewise *healdan on gewunan*, *AH.*, II, 252, 8.

Cuman, *Gegan*, *Agan*, *Gesælan*, *Getidan*, and *Getimian*, all used in the general sense of 'to happen,' are followed by the indicative, as *CP.*, 437, 27, þonan cymð oft þæt mod him ærest na ne *ondræt* ða lybban scylda; *Gen.*, 1562, þa þæt geeode þæt se eadiga wer on his wicum *wearð* wine druncen; *BH.*, 195, 1, oft hit gesæleþ þæt his æhte weorþaþ on onwealde; *Boe.*, 124, 13, getideð oft þæt he *næfð* nauþer ne þisse onweald; *AH.*, II, 168, 34; 426, 1; 430, 31.

Toweard wesan, a common introduction to a prophesy, is also followed by the indicative: *AH.*, I, 78, 35, toweard is þæt Herodes *smeað* hu he þæt cild fordo.

II. The Indirect Interrogative Sentence.

The indirect interrogative sentence is a question stated in dependence upon a governing word, phrase, or clause, which describes the time, manner, and the various circumstances connected with the interrogative expression; it is introduced by an interrogative pronoun, adverb, or conjunction, is to be found after most verbs which serve as introductions to the indirect declarative sentence, and is in a marked degree subject to the same regulations for moods, tenses, etc.

The divisions of introductory verbs of the indirect declarative sentence are also in force in indirect interrogative expressions; here, however, we meet with an additional class— *Verbs of Inquiry*. The interrogative particles are: (1) interrogative pronouns, *hwa* and *hwilc*, with their various paradigmal forms; (2) interrogative adverbs, as *hwonne, hwider, hwanon, hu;* (3) interrogative conjunctions, *hwæðer* and *gif*.

A. Verbs of Inquiry.

Almost all verbs introducing the indirect question may exercise the function of verbs of inquiry, yet most of these retain in the main the characteristics of the special classes to which they belong, and hence they cannot properly be discussed elsewhere. Under this head I shall only consider those verbs which are used simply as expressions of inquiry, as *axian, frignan, fandian*, etc. These verbs form the best and purest type of the indirect question and are quite consistently followed by the subjunctive in the dependent clause.

Acsian.

The dependent verb is usually in the subjunctive; as *LS.*, 10, 9, þa iudeiscan axodon *hwæt* he *wære;* 532, 723; *AH.*, I, 152, 14; *BH.*, 219, 10; *W.*, 141, 13; *Bede*, 96, 29; 114, 30;

Boe., XII, 19; *Matt.*, II, 4; *Luke*, VIII, 9; *Or.*, 182, 19, ahsige eft *hu* lange sio sibb *gestode;* likewise *Or.*, 214, 11; 224, 26; *LS.*, 84, 578; *AH.*, II, 310, 14,—with *hwi*, *AH.*, I, 18, 12; 208, 30; *LS.*, 118, 44; 206, 178; 234, 236,—with *hwær*, *W.*, 152, 17,—*LS.*, 76, 455, axode þone cempan *gif* he *oncneowe* þæt gewrit; likewise 474, 40,—with *hwæðer*, *LS.*, 104, 264; 404, 330; *AH.*, II, 186, 1; *Boe.*, 134, 5.

Sculan generally contains a distinct idea of futurity and in such connections very often takes the place of the simple subjunctive, as *AH.*, I, 14, 22, axode Adam hu heo hatan *sceolde;* *Or.*, 80, 16; *LS.*, 140, 370; *W.*, 220, 13. The construction with *sculan* seems frequently to alternate at pleasure with the subjunctive form or is used by reason of the desired variety of expression, as *W.*, 88, 20, agunnon hi hine acsian hwænne þæt *geweorþan sceolde*, and eac be hwylcum tacene man agytan mihte and hwænne his sylfes tocyme *toweard wurde*, and hwænne þisse worulde geendung *weorðan sceolde*. *Willan* has the true sense of futurity in *LS.*, 104, 244, and its proper sense of volition in *Or.*, 224, 26. The periphrases with *magan* and *motan* are quite frequent, as *CP.*, 48, 8; *LS.*, 38, 224.

Frignan, befrignan.

Frignan and its compound *befrignan* vie with *acsian* in frequency of employment; the latter is the favorite form in *LS.*, *Boe.*, *W.*, and *Gosp.;* the former forms are, with few exceptions, always employed in *BH.* and is specially frequent in Ælfric's writings and in the poetry. *AH.*, I, 502, 23, hi heora biscopes ræde befrunon *hwæt* him he þam to donne *wære;* similarly *LS.*, 174, 16; 200, 102; 204, 162; *Bede*, 96, 21; *Dan.*, 528,—with *hwilc*, *El.*, 849; *LS.*, 226, 117; *AH.*, I, 78, 17; 82, 8; 128, 11; *Or.*, 182, 16, frine hie mon *hu* monegum wintrum sio sibb *gewurde;* similarly *Bede*, 348, 13; *AH.*, II, 130, 26,—with *hwi*, *Or.*, 222, 14; *Bede*, 392, 11; *AH.*, II, 310, 1,—with *hwær*, *AH.*, I, 78, 11; 452, 2; *Gen.*, 1002,—with *hwonan*, *Jul.*, 258. *LS.*, 74, 410, befran *gif* hit soð *wære;* *AH.*, II,

120, 23, befran *hwæðer* þæs landes folc cristen *wære;* 244, 6; *Beow.*, 1320.

Sculan in the sense of duty or obligation is seen in *CP.*, 103, 10, frigne hwæt hi don oððe læran *scylen;* or in a prophetic sense in *Bede*, 296, 8, frugnon hi be his stealle hu be him geweorþan *sceolde*. *Willan* retains its usual sense of intention or design, as *AH.*, II, 30, 7, befran hwider he *wolde gan*, *AH.*, I, 298, 10.

Fandian and its Compounds.

These verbs express an investigation, the results of which are future with reference to the time of the governing verb; they are therefore followed by the subjunctive, as *Gen.*, 1436, fandode hwæþer sincende sæflod þa gyt *wære* under wolcnum; *AH.*, I, 268, 15, swa afandað God þæs mannes mod hwæþer he anræde *sy; Or.*, 164, 28, þæt hie moston gefandian hwæðer hie heora med selþa oferswiðan *mihte;* similarly *Gen.*, 2410; *AH.*, I, 168, 15; *Or.*, 17, 7, 10.

The investigation is frequently made concerning a course of action dependent upon the will of another, and *willan* indicating preference is used in the dependent clause, as *LS.*, 376, 171, afandian hwæðer his mod *wylle* abugan from Gode; 338, 39, þæt he moste his afandian hwæðer he þurhwunian *wolde* on his godnesse oððe he *wolde* from Gode abugan; similarly *Gen.*, 2229.

Cunnian, expressing experimental investigation [*probare, tentare*] is also followed by the subjunctive or by the auxiliary constructions, as *Gen.*, 2846, cunnode georne hwilc þæs æðelinges ellen *wære; Chr.*, 239, E, 37, sceolon cunnian gif hi *mihton* þone here betreppan; *Dan.*, 531, cunnode hu hi cweðan *woldon;* similarly *AH.*, II, 68, 28; *LS.*, 154, 117.

Fricgean has in general similar constructions to other verbs of inquiry, as *Gen.*, 1834, fricgen hwæt *sie* freondlufu. In *El.*, 157, the conjunction is omitted and the interrogative expression is in inverted order: þæs fricgean ongan folces aldor, *wære* þær

ænig yldra oððe gingra. Occasionally the indicative is found in the dependent clause when a question is asked about a real event in present or past time, as *Cr.*, 92, fricgað hu ic fæmnan had mund inne *geheald*.

Hleotan, denoting the means by which the investigation is conducted, agrees with the preceding verbs of inquiry in the constructions following it, as *Or.*, 202, 33, þa hluton þa consulas hwelc hiera ærest þæt gewinn *underfenge;* similarly the phrase *hlot sendan*, *BH.*, 229, 2, hi sendon hlot him betweonum hwyder hyra gehwylc *faran sceolde* to læranne.

B. Verbs of Direct Statement.

1. *Verbs of Simple Report.*

Cweðan.

Cweðan, in its ordinary use as a verb of saying, is rarely followed by the indirect interrogative sentence; the *Cura Past.* furnishes a few instances of it, as 443, 19, næs him no þa giet to gecweden hwæt he mid rihte ðanon forð *don scolde*.

In most of its occurrences in this connection it is evident that the usual signification of *cweðan* as a verb of saying is greatly weakened, and that with the post-posited personal pronoun of the first or second person, this verb is employed merely as an interrogative introductory particle corresponding to Latin *numquid*. The verb of the interrogative clause is generally in the subjunctive; as *CP.*, 175, 5, hwæt cweðe we þonne hwelce *sin* þa inngeðoncas monna? The usual interrogative conjunctive particle is *hwæðer*, as *John*, VII, 26, cweðe we *hwæðer* þa ealdras *ongyten* þæt þis is Crist? [numquid cognoverunt principes, etc.]; *Boe.*, 130, 8, cwist þu *hwæðer* þu his þa halwendan monunge onfon *wille?* [num ejus salutaria suscipere consentis?]. In form alone are these expressions to be regarded as indirect interrogative sentences; they are logically direct questions, but

introduced as they are by *cweðan*, the laws of syntax require the indirect form. Besides the above construction after *cweðan* there are, as has been noted before,[1] two others in frequent use—the dependent clause introduced by *þæt* and the direct interrogative inversion; the latter construction is interchangeable at pleasure with the interrogative introduced by *hwæþer*, as, *e. g.*, Latin 'numquid ego sum' is rendered in *Matt.*, XXVI, 22, by 'cwyst þu *eom ic hyt?*' and in XXVI, 25, by 'cwyst þu *hwæðer ic hyt sy?*'

An indication of the great weakening that has taken place in the signification of *cweðan* under these circumstances is to be found in the numerous instances where this formal introductory word is not employed, but the clause introduced by *hwæþer* remains intact; as *John*, IV, 33, þa cwædon his leorning-cnihtas him betweonan: *Hwæðer* ænig mon him mete brohte? [numquid aliquis attulit ei manducare?] Such constructions are specially frequent in *Boe.*, as 96, 25, hwæþer þu woldest cweðan þæt, etc.; 104, 2, *hwæðer* þe me þince þæt se mon anweald hæbbe?; 120, 6, *hwæðer* þu nu fullice ongite?; 140, 21; 176, 19; 208, 8; 236, 21. This construction persisted and was very common in Middle English, as, *e. g.*, Wiclif in *Matt.*, XXVI, 22 and 25 (quoted above), reads 'Whether Y am?'; *John*, VII, 26 (above), 'Whether the princes knewen verili that this is Crist?'; I. *Cor.*, IX, 1, 'Whether Y am not fre?'; *Mark*, VI, 3, 'Whether this is not a carpenter; whether hise sistris ben not here with us?' etc.

The nearest Latin equivalent to this construction is the Latin direct question introduced by *an*, as *Boe.*, 120, 6, hwæþer þu nu fullice ongite forhwi hit swa seo? [*an* etiam causas cur id tu sit deprehendisti?]; it corresponds, however, to Latin expressions introduced by *num*, as *Boe.*, 236, 21, and by *ne*, as *Boe.*, 176, 19.

Somewhat similar to this construction is the indicative clause introduced by *hu*, as *John*, VI, 42, Hu *nis* þis se Hælend?

[1] See *cweðan*, Indirect Declarative Sentence.

[nonne hic est Iesus?]; XVIII, 26, Hu ne *geseah* ic þe? [nonne ego te vidi?].

Cyðan.

The strongly assertive power of *cyðan* as noted in the indirect declarative sentence is also observable in the indirect interrogative sentence; hence, the indicative is the prevailing mood of the dependent clause in the latter as in the former expression,—*CP.*, 401, 26, he gecyðde hwelc sio scyld *bið;* similarly 465, 18; *AH.*, I, 124, 27; *CP.*, 281, 6; 163, 11, he him gecyðeð hu sio byrðen *wiexð* and *liefegað;* similarly 163, 15; 419, 10; 441, 11; *AH.*, I, 66, 31; 70, 18; 242, 34; II, 142, 20; *LS.*, 392, 154; 466, 400; *El.*, 175; *Ælfric de Novo Test.*, 13, 13; *W.*, 153, 6; *Beow.*, 256; *Or.*, 100, 8.

There is, however, a readier employment of the subjunctive than in the indirect declarative sentences; whenever the interrogative idea is prominent, or when moments of command, condition, negation, and the like, enter, the subjunctive is the rule, as *LS.*, 494, 116, gehwa moste openlice cyðan hwæðer him leofre *wære* þe he þæm witum ætwunde þe he hi for Godes naman acome; *Bede*, 178, 1, hwelc þæs cyninges geleafa *wære*, þæt æfter his deaðe wæs gecyðed; *El.*, 860, ne mihte hire Judes gecyðan be þam sigebeame on hwylcere se hælend *wære;* *Bede*, 328, 20, gif he him þæt gecyðan wolde hwæt he *wære;* likewise *An.*, 800; *Bede*, 90, 29.

The auxiliary constructions are employed with their usual significations, as *sculan* in the sense of duty, *CP.*, 173, 14, nu we willað cyðan hu he læran *sceal;* 103, 3; 409, 21; *willan*, *AH.*, I, 82, 17; *magan*, 163, 3; *motan*, 409, 3.

In *Chr.*, 58, C, 20, the indirect declarative and interrogative sentences both follow *cyðan:* cyðde him *hu* his breðre hæfden wroht an minstre and *þæt* hi hæfden gefreod wið kyning.

Secgan.

A noticeable feature in the indirect interrogative sentence after *secgan* is the frequent employment of the indicative, as *Or.*, 24, 21, nu hæbbe we gesæd ymbe ealle Europe landgemæro hu hi *tolicgaþ;* nu wille we ymbe Affricam [secgan] hu ða landgemæro *tolicgaþ; Or.*, 210, 27, nu ic wylle secgan hulucu heo *wæs; CP.*, 225, 23, gif he him sægð hwonan þæt *cymð* and hu se lytega diaful *styreð* gewinn; *Or.*, 178, 22, þa asædon his geferan hu he heora ærenda *abead.* This frequent use of the indicative is to be explained by the fact that, though interrogative particles are here employed, the interrogative idea is at its lowest point and the dependent clause is no more than an expression of time, place, or manner, with reference to a known object. Indeed, in many cases, these constructions are on the border-line between indirect questions and adverbial or relative clauses, and frequently, when there is identity in the conjunctive particles of these two kinds of expressions, it is impossible to make any clear demarcation.[1] Additional examples of this construction are *Or.*, 250, 28, ic wille eow secgan hwelc mildsung and hwelc geþwærnes siþþan *wæs; CP.*, 163, 8, eac gesægð þæm mannum hu him eac hwilum *eahiað* ða costnunga; 401, 15; *Or.*, 100, 10; 250, 26; *LS.*, 10, 1; 174, 93; 190, 344; 192, 375; 220, 19, 23; 254, 266; 326, 104, 106; *AH.*, I, 116, 31; *John*, XX, 15; *Bede*, 580, 19; *W.*, 192, 13.

There is, however, even here a ready employment of the subjunctive, when negative, imperative, or similar ideas are present either in the main or dependent clause; as *AH.*, I, 386, 13, þær ðe bið gesæd hwæt ðe *gedafenige* to donne [compare *CP.*, 401, 15, ic eow secge hwæt arwyrðlicost *is* to beganne]; *Or.*, 156, 20, hit næs na gesæd hwæt Pirruses folces gefeallen *wære; LS.*, 532, 723, gif ge me secgan woldon hwær Decius

[1] See Mätzner: *Englische Grammatik*, III, 443, *b.*

sy; similarly *Or.*, 3, 13; 194, 24; 260, 6; *LS.*, 308, 24. The subjunctive is regularly found in the genuine indirect question introduced by *gif* or *hwæðer*, as *Matt.*, XXVI, 63, Ic halsige þe þæt þu secge me gif þu *sy* Crist; *Boe.*, 26, 9, gesecge hwæðer þe betere *þince;* similarly 28, 7; 38, 5; *BH.*, 179, 31.

Sculan is frequent in the dependent clause as an exponent of duty and prophecy, as *Or.*, 126, 29, sæde hu he him on his gewill anwyrdan *sceolde; CP.*, 73, 19; 443, 25.

There are numerous examples of the indirect interrogative sentence in addition to a substantive object, as *W.*, 237, 22, secgan ymbe his tocyme and hu he mihte, etc.; *LS.*, 422, 128. The clause serves often to describe the object, as *W.*, 292, 4, secgan be sunnan-dæg-halignesse hu se ælmihtiga God hine gehalgode; similarly *Exod.*, 24; *Wid.*, 54.

Ætiewan.

Ætiewan is distinctively objective in its nature; the interrogative character of the subordinate clause is comparatively weak and it is used mainly for the purpose of narration or description; hence the indicative is generally employed, as *CP.*, 161, 22, ðonne hie ætiewaþ hu manega him *wiðfeohtaþ* and hu æghwylc syn *biþ* sætigende; *Jud.*, 174, het ætiewan hu hyre æt beaduwe *gespeow;* similarly *AH.*, II, 186, 13; 558, 10.

The subjunctive is, however, by no means infrequent; it is due to the final character of the expression, as *Bede*, 292, 33, þæt heo æteowode hu micel leoht Cristes þa halgan in heofonum *ahten* and hwylc gifu heora mægenes *wære;* similarly *CP.*, 161, 15; or to the imperative idea, either in the main clause, as *CP.*, 77, 14, he scealt ætiewan on his lifes gestæððignesse hu micle gesceadwisnesse he *bere* on his breostum, or in the subordinate clause, as *CP.*, 179, 11, buton we ætiewen hwæt hie *healden* ['what they are to lock up']; similarly *Luke*, XII, 5.

When the element of admonition is specially prominent, the periphrasis with *sculan* is employed, as *AH.*, II, 250, 4, wolde

him æteowian hu he oðrum *sceolde* mannum gemiltsian on mislicum gyltum; *BH.*, 237, 12; *Bede*, 350, 34; *AH.*, II, 542, 13.

The chapter-headings introduced by an interrogative particle, mostly *hu*, may be considered as governed by some such verb as *ætiewan*. There are two classes:—

1. Expressions which cannot be regarded as genuine indirect questions, but are merely simple statements, though in an interrogative form. The constructions are as follows:—(1) The indicative, as *CP.*, IV, hu oft sio bisgung ðæs rices *toslit* þæt mod þæs recceres; similarly VIII, IX. (2) The subjunctive of *sculan*, as *CP.*, III, Hu he *scyle* eall earfoðu forsion. [These correspond mostly to Latin *quod* and indicative.] (3) The indicative of *sculan*, as *CP.*, XIII, Hu se lareow *sceal* beon clæne on his mode; similarly XIV, XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII. [These answer to Latin *ut* and subjunctive.]

2. Expressions which are more interrogative or exclamatory in character; *sculan*, answering to Latin *debere*, is here used in either mood, as *CP.*, XII, hu he þæron drohtian *scyle;* XXII, Hu swiðe se reccere *sceal* beon abisgod; likewise XXI, XXIII. Under this head may be included the expressions introduced by *hwelc*, as *CP.*, X, hwelc se beon sceal; similarly XI. They correspond to the true indirect interrogative construction in Latin.

Reccan and its Compounds.

The indirect interrogative clause after these verbs is merely a descriptive statement with almost entire disappearance of the interrogative element. The indicative is, therefore, the usual mood, as *Boe.*, 150, 11, hwelc mæg areccan ures scyppendes anweald hu his gesceafta *weaxaþ* and eac hwæthwegu anlice *beoþ;* *CP.*, 333, 14, gif se lareow him gerecð hu fleonde þis andwearde lif *is*. The strong objective force of the governing verb demands the indicative, even when the indirect interrogative idea is felt, as *Boe.*, 34, 6, ic eow mæg gereccan hwæt se hrof *is* eallra gesælþa; *BH.*, 173, 6, he him rehte hu

mycle scipboran he *gebad* on þam siþe; similarly *CP.*, 441, 12; *AH.*, I, 28, 26; 46, 10; *Or.*, 10, 4; *W.*, 147, 17; *BH.*, II, 436, 19; *Cr.*, 220; *El.*, 648; *Boe.*, XVI, 34; 34, 6; 134, 2; *Mark*, V, 16; *Beow.*, 2096.

The subjunctive occurs at times, due to the negative character of the expression, as *W.*, 28, 6, or to the imperative element, as *Rid.*, XXXIII, 13, rece hwæt sio wiht *sie*. When the idea of duty or command is prominent, *sculan* is used, as *CP.*, 73, 22, we willaþ reccan hu he þæron libban *scyle;* similarly 73, 21; 173, 14.

Bodian and *Geopenian* have strong objective power and are generally followed by the indicative, as *CP.*, 163, 1, ne sceal he no þæt an bodigan hu ða synna him *wiðwinnaþ; AH.*, I, 460, 10; *AH.*, I, 590, 28, þonne geopenige ic þe hu þæt lamb on his rice *þurhwunaþ* ansund; II, 460, 29; *Boe.*, 72, 3.

Eahtan (judge) is followed by the subjunctive in *Cr.*, 1074, as the future idea is strong: wille fæder eahtan hu gesunde suna sawla *bringen* of edle.

Geswutelian is generally followed by the indicative, as *AH.*, I, 272, 24, is geswutelod hu swiðe God *lufaþ* innysse; *W.*, 175, 18, geswutelode hu ure drihten wiþ his þegenas *spæc;* similarly 288, 4; *AH.*, II, 6, 18; 400, 16. The interrogative character of the clause at times requires the subjunctive, as *AH.*, I, 50, 35, is geswutelod hu miclum *fremige* þære soðan lufe gebed; similarly 404, 2. This mood is probably due to final nature of the sentence in *AH.*, II, 180, 22, þæt he him geswutelode hwæt se Benedictus *wære*, and to the future moment in *John*, XVIII, 32, he geswutelode hwylcon deaðe he *geswulte*. The dependent clause introduced by *gif* requires the usual subjunctive, as *AH.*, I, 480, 7, Geswutela me gif þu self *wylle* nyðerastigan. The construction with *sculan* is found in a strong injunction, as *AH.*, II, 64, 9, ic geswutelige ðe hwylcne ðu to cyninge gehalgian *scealt;* similarly 534, 5; *LS.*, 512, 406.

Gyddian and *Onwreon* are followed mostly by the subjunctive, the indirect statement and interrogative form favoring the use of this mood, as *Dan.*, 728, þæt gyddedon gumena mænigeo hwæt seo hand *write; El.*, 674, þu scealt wisdom onwreon hwær seo stow *sie;* similarly *BH.*, 185, 14.

Onbeodan (declare) is strongly objective and followed by the indicative in *Cr.*, 1170, ge eac beamas onbudon hwa hy mid bladum *sceop.*

Opewan is followed by the subjunctive in *Boe.*, 78, 10, influenced probably by the precative character of the governing clause: Ic þe healsige þæt þu me opewe hwæt sio soðe gesælþ *sie.*

Rædan (read) is generally followed by the indicative, as *LS.*, 210, 11, hit gelamp þæt man rædde þætt godspell hu þæt wif *wear*ð gehæled; similarly *Mark*, II, 25; XII, 26; *AH.*, I, 434, 28.

Sprecan is little used to introduce the indirect interrogative clause. In *Or.*, 62, 10, where little more than simple narrative is expressed, the indicative is used; the interrogative nature of the whole expression in *Bede*, 66, 8, favors the use of the subjunctive: Hwæt is to sprecanne hu heo heora ælmesse *dæle* oþþe mildheortnesse *fyllen?*

Tellan and *writan*, in chronicling past events, often use the graphic construction with *hu* with, however, little of the interrogative force; hence the indicative is the rule in the dependent clause, as *Chr.*, 244, F, 6, tealdon þa swyðe ealde menn hu hit *wæs gelagod* sona syððan; *AH.*, II, 306, 18, þus wrat Hieronimus be þære halgan rode hu heo *wear*ð gefunden; similarly 84, 23; 360, 1; 468, 4; 486, 4. In an admonitory sense these verbs are generally followed by the construction with *sculan*, as *CP.*, 52, 10, is geteald hwelc he beon *sceal; Chr.*, 244, F, 15, sende gewrit hu he biscopas halgian and on hwylcum stowe hi settan *sceolde.* This construction is also employed to express certain action in the future, as *An.*, 135, hæfdon awriten hwænne hie to mose meteþearfendum weorðan *sceoldon.*

Remark. The assertive force of the introductory words and the interrogative character of the dependent clause produce an interesting conflict in which now the one now the other prevails; hence there is a remarkable diversity in the moods employed after verbs of this class.

2. *Verbs of Saying with the Element of Volition.*

In the following verbs the action of the will is expressed either in the form of a petition or of an injunction. The usual mood, therefore, of the interrogative clause is the subjunctive, with frequent occurrence of the constructions with *sculan, willan,* etc.

Anstellan (prescribe) is followed by *sculan* in *W.*, 218, 28, he anstealde hu men *sceoldan* þone halgan sunnandæg healdan.

Bebeodan, with *sculan* in *CP.*, 169, 20, Dryhten bebead hu he *scolde* beran þa earc.

Bysen, as an expression of advice, is followed by *sculan,* as *Bede,* 46, 9, þa sealdon hi him bysne hu hi him wæpen wyrcan *sceoldon.* As a simple reference to a past event, the indicative is used, as *LS.*, 440, 131, manega bysna synd on bocum be swylcum, hu oft weras and wif wundorlice *drohtnodon.*

Gestihtian (appoint) with *sculan* in *CP.*, 99, 11, gestihtode hu men *sceolden* ðærinne bet macian.

Getacnian is followed either by the subjunctive, as *Bede,* 98, 28, þæt he us to getacnode hwelc gesetnes to fylgenne *sy,* or by the construction with *sculan,* as *Bede,* 90, 5, he getacnode hu he *sceolde* oþre biscopas halgian; similarly *CP.*, 451, 10. Used as a simple statement, it is followed by *willan* in the prophetic sense in *John,* XII, 33, tacnode hwylcum deaðe he *wolde* sweltan; similarly XXI, 19.

Læran is generally followed by the periphrasis with *sculan,* as *CP.*, 341, 15, ðonne sint sie siððan to læranne hu hi *scilen* mildheortlice dælan; likewise 389, 18; 441, 6; *BH.*, 19, 14; *Bede,* 64, 12. The simple subjunctive is also found, as *Bede,* 216, 11, lærde hwæt ymb þara hælo to donne *wære.* As a

simple verb of announcement it is followed by the indicative, as *W.*, 242, 13, lærð hwonne seo tid *cymð*.

Rædan, as an expression of advice, is followed either by the simple subjunctive or by the construction with *sculan*, as *W.*, 51, 19 and 57, 15, þe him geræda ð æfre hwæt him to donne *sy;* likewise *Bede*, 50, 9. The auxiliary *magan*, expressing possibility, is found in *LS.*, 426, 202, rædde him sona hu he beswican *mihte* his agenne fæder. The same constructions are noted after phrases with *ræd*, as *Beow.*, 172. In the vivid style of poetry the result of advice given is usually emphasized by the use of the indicative in the dependent clause, as *Beow.*, 277, Ic þæs Hroðgar mæg ræd gelæran hu he feond *oferswiðeð*, gif him ed-wendan æfre scolde bot eft cuman.

Sciran, with *sculan* in *AH.*, II, 290, 9, he ne scyrde on hwæðre healfe hi þæt net wurpan *sceoldon*.

Tæcan, as a verb of admonition, is followed by *sculan*, as *AH.*, II, 472, 30, tæhte hwilcere getimbrunge we *sceolon* to heofonum astigan. The simple subjunctive is seen in *An.*, 485, where *tæcan* has the meaning 'to instruct': getæhte hu þu wægflotan sund *wisige*.

Tyhtan is followed by the subjunctive in *W.*, 292, 1, þæt we æfre sculon tyhtan hu ge *agan* her on life rihtlice to libbanne.

Wisian is followed by *sculan* in *Gen.*, 850, him gewisode hu hie on þam leohte forð libban *sceolden;* similarly *W.*, 304, 18; *An.*, 1100.

C. Verbs of Thinking, Believing, etc.

The subjunctive is the usual mood in the interrogative clause after these verbs.

þencan.

þencan has two distinct meanings: (1) to devise, (2) to consider, reflect, remember.

In the former meaning, with reference to a certain end to be attained, *þencan* is followed by the subjunctive of *magan*, denoting the final nature of the sentence, as *LS.*, 200, 95, þu beþenc þe hu þu *mæge* ætwindan ðam ecum witum; *CP.*, 239, 12, sceal þencan hu he hie gelicettan *mæge;* similarly *LS.*, 200, 93; *Or.*, 76, 24; *BH.*, 55, 19; *Boe.*, 90, 8. It is also frequently followed by the simple subjunctive or by the periphrases with *sculan* or *willan*, as *Seaf.*, 117, þonne geðencen hu we þider *cumen; CP., 41, 23*, þonne hie þenceaþ hu hi sylfe *scylen* fulfremodeste weorðan; 101, 10, he geðohte hu he *wolde* þæt man him miltsode, 273, 5.

With its second signification, in which the final nature of *þencan* is lost, this verb is followed either by the subjunctive or by the indicative. The subjunctive is employed where the elements of interrogation or futurity are present, as *CP.*, 45, 24, hwæt þencaþ þa hwy hie ðara geearnunga bet *truwigen* ðonne etc; *BH.*, 41, 14, þence hwylcum edleane he *onfo; Boe.*, 250, 5, geþenc nu hwæðer þu ænig þing getiohhod *hæbbe;* similarly *CP.*, 329, 12; *W.*, 303, 33; *Boe.*, 116, 26. The indicative is, however, more generally employed in the dependent clause; it is regularly found when the thought is directed to the consideration of an actual occurrence, as *CP.*, 5, 5, geþenc hwelce witu us þa *becomon* for þisse worulde; 37, 23, ne geþencan ne con hwæt him *losaþ;* 357, 15; 467, 1. The conjunctive particle is generally *hu* and the expression is more properly an indirect exclamation, as *BH.*, 33, 25, to geðencanne *hu* micel Godes geþyld *is* and hu mycel ure ungeþyld *is;* similarly *CP.*, 159, 6; 233, 14; 315, 15; 329, 9; 343, 15; 359, 18; 377, 3; 391, 20; 437, 9; 447, 29; *Or.*, 122, 15; 296, 21; *W.*, 144, 29; *Matt.*, XVI, 9, 10.

In *BH.*, 91, 13, uton we geðencan hwylc andlean we him forð to berenne *habban;* uton we geðencan hu mycel egesa *gelimpeð* eallum gesceaftum, the distinctively interrogative nature of the first subordinate clause is expressed by the subjunctive, while the second clause, having rather an exclama-

tory character with reference to a real event, contains the indicative.

Smeagan.

Smeagan has similar distinctions in meaning to *ðencan* and hence a corresponding variation of constructions in the indirect interrogative clause. In its more usual meaning, 'to devise,' it is followed by the simple subjunctive or by the periphrastic construction with *magan;* when the will of the subject is made emphatic in the dependent clause, *willan* is here used. *AH.*, I, 78, 35, Herodes smeaŏ hu he þæt cild *fordo; LS.*, 514, 452; *AH.*, I, 225, 20, smeaŏ hu he hit gewrecan *mæge; LS.*, 224, 13; *AH.*, I, 12, 1; 16, 31; 18, 34; 26, 22; 192, 15; 286, 29; II, 6, 13; *Boe.*, 2, 17; *W.*, 280, 17. In *AH.*, II, 268, 7, we find both constructions after the same governing verb: smeagaŏ hu se hlaf *mage beon* gewend to Cristes lichaman, oþþe þæt win *weorŏe* awend to Drihtnes blode.

When *smeagan* is used with the meaning 'to think, consider, reflect,' there is considerable variation in the moods in the interrogative clause. The indicative is employed when the attention is directed to an event which has actually taken place or whose reality is unquestioned, as *CP.*, 75, 5, þæt he smeage hu micel nied-þearf him *is; AH.*, I, 308, 19, is to smeagenne hu seo clænnys *wæs demde* geond ða geferedan ðenas. When, however, the interrogative nature of the clause is prominent, the subjunctive is regularly employed, as *LS.*, 226, 109, Petrus smeade hwæt his gesihŏ *gemænde; AH.*, I, 12, 18, smeaŏ hwanon deofol *come;* 340, 20, is to smeagenne hwi *sy* mare blis be gecyrredum synfullum þonne, etc.; similarly 48, 9; 68, 13; 542, 31; *LS.*, 244, 113. In *AH.*, I, 342, 14, is to smeagenne hu micelum se rihtwisa God *gegladige* gif etc, the subjunctive is due to the conditional nature of the clause. *AH.*, II, 228, 20 is a rare instance of the indicative in the interrogative clause introduced by *gif:* smeaga gehwa gif þæs beboda and oþre þillice *habbaŏ* ænigne stede on his heortan.

In the dependent clause after the allied verb *foresmeagan*, the subjunctive is quite consistently found, as *Mark*, XIII, 11, ne foresmeage ge hwæt ge *specan; Luke*, XXI, 14.

Wenan.

A noticeable feature of the interrogative construction with *wenan* is that the whole expression (both principal and subordinate clauses) is interrogative. These are really direct questions and *wenan* is not the principal verb, though it has this grammatical function; it is used simply to express a certain deference to the views of another or to indicate mere probability. The subjunctive is almost always used in the subordinate clause. The indirect interrogative constructions after *wenan* are of two kinds:—

1. The interrogative particle is used before the introductory phrase *wene we* or *wene ge* and also (frequently in a different form) before the grammatically dependent clause, as *CP.*, 353, 10, hu wene we hu micel scyld þæt *sie?; Or.*, 50, 1, hu wene we hwelce sibbe þa weras *hæfden?; Boe.*, 64, 16, hwæt wenst þu hu micelne hlisan Romanisc man *mæge habban?;* similarly *Or.*, 64, 5; 136, 21. When the interrogative adjective and its substantive are placed before *wenan*, the rest of the dependent sentence follows in the indirect construction introduced by *þæt*, as *CP.*, 281, 14, hwelc wite wene we *þæt* se fela spræca scyle habban?; similarly *AH.*, I, 442, 8.

2. The common introductory phrase, *wenstu hwæþer;* as *CP.*, 425, 1, wenstu hwæþer he hine miδ þy gehealdan *mæge?; Boe.*, 102, 10, wenst þu hwæþer hine ænig habban *mæge?* Occasionally the interrogative clause is grammatically independent of *wenstu* and the indicative is used, as *Luke*, I, 66, wenst þu hwæt *byδ* þes cnapa? ['What, think you, will this boy be?'].

Apinsian (weigh, estimate). The final idea is not present with this verb; the consideration is directed to the interroga-

tive clause regarded merely as a unit, hence the indicative is used in the latter; as *W.*, 245, 9, hit is to apinsjanne hwæt hit *getacnaþ*.

Carfull, *Carian*, and *Cepan* express attention directed to the attainment of a certain state, and hence the subjunctive follows, as *W.*, 72, 10, weorþe se carfull hu he swiðast *mæge gecweman* his drihtne; *AH.*, II, 78, 2, ða þe cariað hu hi manna sawla Gode *gestrynan*; *LS.*, 386, 36, cepte hu he *cwemde* Gode; 322, 48.

Costan, implying an investigation into an existing state of things, is followed by the indicative in *Cr.*, 1059, bryne costaþ hu gehealdne *sind* sawle wiþ synnum fore sige deman.

Cyre expresses an alternative whose regular construction is *hwæþer-oþþe* and the subjunctive, as *AH.*, I, 212, 11, gehwilc man hæfþ agenne cyre hwæðer he *wille* fylian deofles willan oþþe wiðsacan. A peculiar sequence is that with the correlative *swa-swa*, *AH.*, I, 112, 11, forgeaf he Adame and Evan agenne cyre, swa hi on gesælþe wunodon, swa hi deadlice wurðon.

Efstan, *Geornful*, *Geþeahtian*, *Gieman*, *Hogian*, *Hycgan*, *Ondrædan*, and *Reccan*, denoting thought directed either to the accomplishment of a certain action or merely to the consideration of a future event, are followed by the simple subjunctive or by the subjunctive of *magan*; the final clause is generally introduced by the conjunction *hu*. *W.*, 138, 8, efsteð hu he synfullum susle *gefremme*; *AH.*, II, 440, 17, Martha wæs geornful hu heo *mihte* God fedan; *Bede*, 248, 5, geþeahte hwæt to donne *wære*; *Mark*, III, 6, þeahtedon ongen hine hu hi hine fordon *mihten*; similarly *Gen.*, 92; *Matt.*, XII, 14; *Bede*, 72, 25; 162, 30; 350, 16; *Cr.*, 1569, þæs gieman nele hu þa womsceaðan hyra eadgestreon sare *geseten*; 1553; *Mark*, III, 2; *AH.*, I, 124, 14, hogiað hwilc se *becume* ætforan gesihðe ðæs strecan Demes; 316, 25; *Gen.*, 432, hycgað hie ealle hu ge hi *beswicen*; *Seaf.*, 117; *Or.*, 138, 5, hi him þæt swiðe ondrædon hu hi wiþ him eallum endemes *mehten*; 88, 13; *CP.*, 447, 27, reccað hwæt him mon ymbe

ræswe; 451, 26. The subjunctive is also always used when the interrogative idea is prominent, as *Rid.*, XXIX, 13, micel is to hycganne hwæt seo wiht *seo;* XXXII, 24; *Dan.*, 130.

Secan is regularly followed by the subjunctive, since the element of interrogation is specially prominent in the subordinate clause, as *Bede*, 158, 1, sohte hwæt þæt *wære; Dan.*, 732, sohton hwæt seo hand *write* halges gastes; similarly 79; *BH.*, 205, 27; *AH.*, II, 448, 9; *El.*, 415, 474; *Mark*, XI, 13; XIV, 1; *Luke*, XII, 29; *Bede*, 124, 19. *Secan* frequently expresses effort directed toward the accomplishment of an action; hence *magan* is often found in the dependent clause, as *CP.*, 227, 14, secð hu he hine *mæge* onfon; 239, 8; *LS.*, 490, 53; 500, 231; *Or.*, 140, 8; *Dan.*, 49; *El.*, 1156.

Sorgian, referring to action in future time, is followed by the subjunctive, as *Bede*, 282, 29, sorgende on hwylcre tide þone dæl þæs mynstres þæt ilce wite *gehrine;* similarly *Seaf.*, 42.

Swician and *Syrwian*, introducing expressions of design with the conjunction *hu*, are followed by the subjunctive or the periphrasis with *magan*, as *LS.*, 252, 220, swicað se deofol embe us hu he *forlære* þa cristenan; 242, 80, þas þry syrwiað hu hi us *beswicen; AH.*, I, 214, 31, syrwedon hu hi *mihton* hine to deaðe gebringan; *Or.*, 144, 35.

Tweon, *Tweogan*, *Twynan*, *Twynung*. The element of doubt and uncertainty is present in full force in the interrogative clause following these expressions, and the subjunctive is the usual mood, as *Or.*, 230, 19, tweode hwæðer hi aweg *comen; W.*, 196, 11, tweonað fela manna hwæðer he *sy* se soða Godes Sunu oððe na ne *sy; BH.*, 205, 10, wæs mycel tweo hwæt hie he þære *don*, hwæðer hii ða cyricean *halgeden*, oþþe hwæt þæs Godes willa *wære;* similarly *Or.*, 192, 15; *AH.*, I, 556, 14; *W.*, 2, 5; 3, 7; *Bede*, 2, 14.

Þyncan is followed by the subjunctive or by the construction with *magan*, as *Rid.*, XXXII, 18, wrætlic me þincð hu seo wiht *mæge lacan*. A construction similar to that with *wenan* is seen in *Or.*, 182, 22, hu þyncð eow Romanum hu seo sibb gefæstnod *wære*.

Ymbhydig, with a strongly interrogative and future sense, is followed by the subjunctive, as *Matt.*, VI, 25, þæt ge ne *syn* ymbhidige eowre sawle hwæt ge *etan* ne eowrum lichaman mid hwæm ge *syn* ymbscrydde; similarly *Luke*, XII, 22.

D. Verbs of Direct Perception.

The indirect interrogative expression after these verbs is either used as a vivid method of representing the events described, or may be looked upon as a mere object toward which the action of perception is directed; in both cases the objective force of the introductory verb is very strong and the interrogative nature of the dependent clause very weak, and hence the prevailing mood is the indicative. The subjunctive, however, enters when the interrogative nature of the sentence is emphasized or when moments of condition, concession, and the like, enter into the expression.

Witan and *Ne Witan.*

The strongly objective character of *witan* is felt in the indirect interrogative just as in the indirect declarative sentence, and the usual mood of the subordinate clause is the indicative, as *Or.*, 214, 1, ic wat hwæt se Romana gelp swiðost *is; CP.*, 343, 21, se ðe wat hwær he hiene *leget;* similarly *AH.*, I, 114, 3; 268, 16; 588, 17; II, 568, 15; *Or.*, 126, 31; 136, 20; 190, 13; *LS.*, 164, 290; 464, 368; *CP.*, 43, 22; *W.*, 123, 17; *Ph.*, 355; *Wand.*, 29.

The subjunctive is to be found, when the dependent clause is a genuine interrogative expression in sense as well as in form, when it treats of general assumptions or vague abstract ideas, and when it is either by nature or attraction conditional, concessive, or hortatory in character. The future idea is expressed either by the subjunctive or by the periphrases with *sculan* and *willan*.

Examples of these constructions are as follows: *Bede*, 432, 27, þæt ic wolde gewitan hwæt he beon *sceolde;* *W.*, 18, 15, he wille witan hu we him geleanod *habban* ealle; *AH.*, I, 336, 23, gif ic wiste hwæt he *wære;* *Boe.*, 162, 21, hie woldon witan hu heah hit *wære* to þam hefone and hu dicke se hefon *wære* oððe hwæt þær ofer *wære* [an abstract conception]: *CP.*, 427, 21, þæt men witen hwelce hi *sin;* *John*, VII, 51, demð ure æ ænine man buton hine man ær gehyre and wite hwæt he *do;* similarly *Beow.*, 2520; *Matt.*, XXIV, 43; *Luke*, VII, 39; XII, 39; *John*, VII, 17, 51; XI, 57; *CP.*, 51, 5; *Bede*, 100, 24. In *Luke*, VII, 39, the indirect interrogative and declarative constructions follow the same verb: gyf þes man witega wære he wiste hwæt and hwylc þys wif *wære*, þæt heo synful *ys*. The difficulty in seeking to establish any fixed rule for mood in these constructions is obvious when we consider the great variation in the use of the moods, even at times in the same sentence, as *Chr.*, 354, E, 36, gif hwa gewilnigaþ to gewitanne hu gedon he *wæs*, oððe hwilcne wurðscipe he hæfde, oððe hu fela land he *wære* hlaford, etc.; *Luke*, X, 22, nan man nat hwilc *is* se sunu ne hwilc *si* se fæder.

Sculan and *willan* are regularly employed with the usual ideas of duty, volition, and futurity, as *CP.*, 65, 11, se ðe wat hwider he gan *sceal;* *Luke*, XII, 39, gif se ealdor wiste hwænne se ðeof cuman *wolde;* similarly *LS.*, 280, 266; 380, 247; *AH.*, II, 254, 8; *Boe.*, 14, 2.

Ne witan shows the same peculiarities as *witan* in the syntax of the indirect interrogative sentence; the usual mood of the dependent clause is therefore the indicative, as *AH.*, I, 532, 25, he nat hwæðer he wurðe *is* into þam ecan rice; *LS.*, 352, 226, he nat hu he *færð* for his freondlicum drencum; *Chr.*, 305, E, 12, nan man neste hwæt þæs ealles *wæs;* similarly *Or.*, 120, 1; 124, 13; 206, 3; *CP.*, 41, 1; 63, 10; 241, 12; 429, 26; *AH.*, I, 256, 15; II, 104, 9; 236, 35; *BH.*, 17, 12; 223, 16; *W.*, 248, 15; *Seaf.*, 55; *Beow.*, 1332; *John*, IX, 21.

The general uses of the subjunctive are the same as with *witan*, as *LS.*, 454, 206, se oðer nyste hu he ham *come;* *Boe.*,

160, 3, ða sæde ic þe þæt ic nyste hu he ealra gesceafta *weolde; LS.*, 490, 44; *W.*, 238, 15; *AH.*, 104, 25; 306, 8. The subjunctive is also used in the dependent clause when the probability of knowledge is implied; as *AH.*, I, 92, 30, wen is þæt eower sum nyste hwæt *sy* ymbsnidenys. In *Boe.*, 46, 7, þæm neatum is gecynde þæt hi nyton hwæt hi *send*, ac þæt is þara manna unþeow þæt hi nyton hwæt hi *sien*, Hotz explains the difference in mood by the fact that the indicative denotes absolute ignorance, while in the subjunctive there lies the idea of the probability of enlightenment. The subjunctive is found when an alternative is implied, as *LS.*, 256, 293, nyte we hwæþer se weardmann *wære* æfre gefullod [he may or may not have been baptized]; also when there is ignorance expressed with reference to a future event, as *CP.*, 323, 23, hi nyton mid hwam hie hit þe *forgielden; Or.*, 78, 15; 212, 25. The less frequent method of expressing the alternative by *swa-swa* is found in *LS.*, 506, 306, ne we be him naðor nyton *swa* hi þær libban *swa* hi þær deade licgan.

Ongietan.

There is probably more regularity in the use of the indicative in the indirect interrogative clause after *ongietan* than after *witan*. The subjunctive element in the leading verb is here wholly absent and the interrogative nature of the clause is much obscured. *CP.*, 429, 24, hi ongietað hwæt ymb hi gedon *bið; Wand.*, 73, ongitan sceal gleawhæle hu gæstlic *bið; Boe.*, 136, 20, ic ne mæg ongitan forhwi þu eft *segst*. The *hu*-clause is of special frequency, as *Boe.*, 30, 14, þu miht ongitan hu þa mine sælþa *is* oncerred; other examples are *CP.*, 220, 6; 231, 16; 233, 23; 239, 4; 241, 16; 257, 20; 271, 22; 277, 4; 343, 12; 375, 23; 377, 22; 389, 8; 393, 31; 405, 8; 431, 13; 441, 8; 465, 22; *Or.*, 62, 32; 194, 9; *W.*, 252, 5; *Boe.*, 44, 31; 46, 4; 136, 20; 180, 2.

The indicative is very persistent in the dependent clause and a considerable influence is required to change it into the

subjunctive; it is doubtful whether any examples could be brought forward for the use of the subjunctive simply on account of the interrogative nature of the dependent clause. When the sentence is negative, the subjunctive is occasionally met with, as *LS.*, 530, 671, ic ongytan ne mæg hu me *sy* þus gelumpen. The most frequent occurrences of the subjunctive are due to the final or interrogative character of the whole expression, as *CP.*, 75, 7, þæt he ongyte for hwæs geðyncðum þæt folc *sie* genemned heord; *Boe.*, 150, 19, hwæt þu nu ongite forhwy þæt fyr *fundige* up?; similarly *CP.*, 183, 8. The usual subjunctive after *hwæþer* is seen in *Boe.*, 34, 9, miht þu nu ongitan hwæþer þu auht þe deorwyrþre *habbe*.

Gehieran.

As an expression of direct sense-perception *gehieran* is almost invariably followed by the indicative in the interrogative clause, as *CP.*, 299, 13, gehieren hwæt he eft *cwæð; BH.*, 19, 10, gehyran me nu forhwon se blinda leoht *onfeng;* similarly *CP.*, 299, 7, 15, 18, 21, 22; 315, 23; 317, 13, 15, 20, 21, 23; 323, 4, 7; 359, 9; *AH.*, I, 464, 10; II, 300, 5; *LS.*, 10, 11; 24, 1; 363, 375; *BH.*, 165, 15; *Matt.*, XXVII, 13; *Byr.*, 45; *El.*, 514.

In some cases the interrogative idea in the dependent clause claims recognition and the subjunctive is used, as *AH.*, I, 280, 8, uton we gehyran he þam Halgan Gaste hwæt he *sy*. Introduced by *gif* or *hwæðer*, the subjunctive is regular, as *LS.*, 468, 448, mon ne gehyrde gif ænig scypherde *wære*.

Geseon.

Geseon is generally followed by the indicative, as *CP.*, 157, 16, ðu ne miht geseon hwæt þærinne *byð* gehydde; 5, 9, ic geseah hu þa ciricean geond eall Angelcynn *stodon* madma gefyldne; *Gen.*, 666, ic mæg geseon hwær he self *sitteð;* likewise *Exod.*, 83; *W.*, 199, 6; *LS.*, 402, 291; *BH.*, 229, 20;

Cr., 1134. The indicative often occurs even after the conjunctions *gif* and *hwæðer*, as *CP.*, 157, 16, mæg man geseon gif þær hwelc dieglu scond inne *bið; AH.*, II, 414, 19, we sceolon geseon hwæðer ðin Iacobus þe *alyst* fram ðisum bendum.

There are a few instances of the subjunctive, mostly when the act of perception is future with reference to the time of the leading verb, as *Boe.*, 58, 4, hine lyste geseon hu seo *burne; Mark*, XV, 36, þæt we geseon hwæðer Helias *cume* hine niðer to settanne; *Luke*, XIX, 3, he wolde geseon hwylc se Hælend *wære* [the action is not described as taking place]. The subjunctive is due to the negative character of the sentence in *AH.*, I, 433, 14. *Sculan* has its usual signification of obligation in *CP.*, 365, 14, þæt we magon geseon hwæt we don *scylen.*

In *Gen.*, 1270, the indirect interrogative and indirect declarative constructions follow the same governing verb: þa geseah sigora waldend *hwæt* wæs manna manas on eorðan and *þæt* hie wæron womma þriste inwitfulle.

Ametan (estimate) is followed by the subjunctive in *CP.*, 53, 13, due probably to the final character of the expression: þæt ge ameten hwæt ge *sien.*

Behealdan. The indicative is generally found in the indirect interrogative clause, as *Boe.*, 68, 21, behealde he hu widgille þæs heofones hwearfe *bið; AH.*, I, 242, 27, behealde ge hwæðer ge *sint* Godes scep; similarly *Boe.*, 180, 5; *AH.*, I, 582, 12; *LS.*, 494, 107; *Rid.*, XVIII, 5. Occasionally the interrogative character of the dependent clause outweighs the objective nature of *behealdan* and the subjunctive is used, as *Bede*, 288, 14, mid þy heo behealdende wæs hwelcum teonde up ahafen *wære* se wlite þæs wuldorlican lichoman. This is specially so after *hwæðer*, as *AH.*, II, 76, 31, behealde hwæðer he on Godes wingearde *swince.*

Besceawian expresses close observation of certain events which are vividly described by the indicative in the indirect clause, as *Matt.*, VI, 28, besceawiað þa lilian hu hi *weaxað; AH.*, I, 488, 20, besceawiað hu wræcfill þis andwearde lif *is;* similarly *Luke*,

XII, 24; *BH.*, 59, 22; *AH.*, I, 486, 17; II, 84, 7. In the sense of a verb of inquiry, *besceawian* is followed by the subjunctive, as *AH.*, II, 500, 32.

Cunnan is generally followed by the indicative, as *Beow.*, 2071, þæt þu geare cunne to hwam siððan *wearð* hond-ræs hæleþa; 162, men ne cunnon hwyder hel-runan hwyrftum *scriðað; Cr.*, 573; *Ælfric's Pref. Gen.*, 22, 25. The indicative is found even after *hwæðer*, as *Beow.*, 1356. The subjunctive is, however, frequent when ideas of indefiniteness or uncertainty are present, especially when the expression is future or negative, as *Bede*, 136, 6, hwæt þær *foregenge* oððe hwæt þær *æfterfige* we ne cunnon; likewise *El.*, 531; *W.*, 298, 31. *Willan* is used in the sense of design or futurity in *Wand.*, 71; *An.*, 342.

Cuð, Sweotol, Undyrne. The interrogative clause is set forth in the most objective manner by these expressions, and the indicative is used, as *Boe.*, 32, 36, nis hit sweotol hu hwerflice þa woruld-sælþa *sint; Beow.*, 2001, þæt is undyrne hwylc orleg-hwil uncer Grendles *wearð* on þam wange; similarly *BH.*, 183, 9; *Rid.*, XLIII, 15. In expressions of uncertainty, negation, and the like, the subjunctive or modal auxiliaries are sometimes employed, as *Gen.*, 2709, ne wæs cuð hwæðer on þyssum folce frean Ælmihtiges egesa *wære; BH.*, 51, 35, is swiðe uncuð hwæt ure yrfenweardas don *willen* æfter urum life.

Findan is usually followed by the indicative, as *El.*, 202, þa se æðeling fand hwar ahangen *wæs* rodora waldend; *Ælfric de Vet. Test.*, 2, 47.

Forgietan, essentially a negative verb of perception, is followed by the indicative, as *CP.*, 183, 23, ne sculon we forgietan hu hit *wæs* be Saule. *Sculan* in the sense of obligation is met with in *CP.*, 387, 14.

Ge-, On, To-cnawan. The strongly objective nature of these verbs and the interrogative character of the dependent clause cause an interesting variation of mood. The indicative is, however, mostly employed, as *AH.*, I, 410, 9, þæt heo oncnawe mid hwilcum feondum heo ymbset *bið; CP.*, 349, 24, we magon

oncnawan hu micel yfel sio gesceadwislice gecynd *gefremeð;* likewise *Or.*, 94, 21; *AH.*, I, 588, 8; *W.*, 189, 3. Besides those instances in which the subjunctive is due to the interrogative character of the dependent clause, this mood is quite common when the whole expression is interrogative, as *AH.*, I, 14, 4, hu mihte Adam tocnawan hwæt he *wære?* It is specially frequent after *hwæþer*, as *W.*, 60, 3, man mæg þæne man tocnawan hwæðer him Godes gast on *wunige* oððe ðæs deofles, in which case an alternative is emphatically stated; similarly in *LS.*, 534, 743; *John*, VII, 17. When the alternative is not so strongly felt the indicative at times occurs, as *AH.*, II, 228, 22, ðonne gecnæwð hwæðer he *is* of Gode.

Gefrignan and *Geleornian* are regularly followed by the indicative, as *Beow.*, 1, we Gar-Dena þrym gefrunon hu þa æðelingas ellen *fremedon;* 2404; *AH.*, I, 438, 3, ge geleornodon hu se heahengel Gabriel ðam eadigan mædene Marian æðelinges acennednysse *gecyðde.* The constructions with *sculan* and *magan*, expressing duty and ability respectively, are common, as *CP.*, 101, 9, he geleornode hu he *sceolde* oðrum mannum miltsian; *Or.*, 158, 3, hæfdon geleornod hu hie þa elpendes beswican *mehton.*

Gemunan, To gemynde cuman, Gemyndig beon, Gemyndgan, and *Gemynd genywian*, all having the common signification of remembrance, are followed by the indicative in the indirect interrogative clause; this construction is employed to bring before the mind in a vivid manner various occurrences of past time. The *hu*-clause is almost universal; as *CP.*, 7, 15, þa ic þe gemunde hu sio lar afeallen *wæs* geond Angelcynn; *AH.*, I, 46, 15, gemynd genywode hu Moyses heora foregengan *gelædde* and hu hi on westene *wæron;* similarly 6, 9; 52, 25; 226, 6; *CP.*, 3, 2; 5, 25; *BH.*, 129, 10; 237, 9; *W.*, 258, 8; *Boe.*, 10, 3. There are frequent examples of the use of a substantive object and also of the indirect interrogative clause either to describe the object or to make an additional statement, as *Or.*, 82, 15, Themistocles gemyndgode Jonas þære ealdan fæhðe *hu he hie on his geweald genidde; Wand.*, 34,

geman he sele, secgas, and sincþege, *hu hine on geoguðe his goldwine wenede to wiste; BH.*, 129, 10, hie gemunað þa mycelan eaðmodnesse and *hu luflice he us ærest gesohte;* similarly *Jul.*, 624; *Rid.*, LXXX, 7. The interrogative construction, however, occasionally leads to the use of the subjunctive, as *Dan.*, 110, com on sefan hwurfan swefnes woma hu woruld *wære* wuldrum geteod; *AH.*, II, 22, 21, uton beon gemyndige hu micelre geðincðe *sy* þæt hælige mæden; the vagueness of a vision in the former, and the hortatory character of the latter expression favor the use of the subjunctive.

Hlistan is followed by the subjunctive in *W.*, 132, 8, hliste we on Englisc hwæt þæt Læden *cwæde.*

Locian is generally followed by the indicative, as *Exod.*, 278, ge lociað færwundra sum hu ic sylfa *sloh.* This verb is mostly used in the imperative in an exclamatory sense, corresponding to Latin *ecce*, as *John*, XI, 36, loca hu he hine lufode [ecce quomodo amabat eum]; *Mark*, II, 24, loca nu hwæt þine leorningcnihtas *doð* [ecce quid faciunt]; similarly *Matt.*, XXI, 20; *Mark*, XI, 21; XV, 4. There are sporadic occurrences of the subjunctive, as *AH.*, I, 474, 25, loca hu lange se soða læce hit *foresceawige.*

Scrutnian is generally followed by the indicative in the interrogative clause introduced by *hu*, as *AH.*, I, 582, 25, scrutniað hu deorlice hit *is* to geogenne.

Undergietan and *Understandan* are followed by the same construction as *oncnawan: AH.*, I, 146, 30, understandað hu be hire awriten is; similarly *W.*, 32, 8; 108, 6; 122, 11; 308, 18; *Ælfric's Pref. Gen.*, 23, 32; *AH.*, II, 58, 13; 82, 33; 120, 10; 334, 28. In *LS.*, 372, 132, nellað understandan hu stuntlice hi *doð*, oððe hu se deada stan him *mæge* gehelpan, the indicative denotes entire ignorance of the true character of the men's actions, while the subjunctive implies a doubt as to the efficacy of the stone.

Wlitan and its compounds. The indicative is used in the interrogative clause after these verbs, as *Ph.*, 341, Wlitað hu seo wilgedryht wildne *weorðiað.* The subjunctive is often

used in descriptions of future time, as *Jul.*, 399, þæt ic gehygd eal geondwlite hu afæstnod *sy* ferhð; also after *hwæðer*, as *Cr.*, 1330.

Wundrian. The contents of the indirect interrogative clause after this verb have a genuine interrogative or rather an exclamatory signification; hence the subjunctive is the prevailing mood, as *Or.*, 134, 12, þa wundrode Alexander hwy hit swa æmenne *wære; Cr.*, 1016, nis ænig wundor hu him woruld manna seo unclæne gecynd cearum sorgende *ondrede;* similarly *Boe.*, 40, 4; 172, 5; 244, 20; 248, 2; 250, 19; *AH.*, I, 590, 23; *Bede*, 346, 30; *Mark*, XV, 44.

Indirect interrogative clauses are almost entirely wanting after simple introductory expressions; the nearest approach to this construction is in such sentences as *Ælfric de Vet. Test.*, 7, 38, an is Parabole wisdomes bigspell and warnung and *hu man selost mæg synna forbugan,* and hit stent þurh Godes gyfa *hu us bið æt Gode gedemed.*

III. The Moods in Indirect Discourse.

A. The Moods in the Indirect Declarative Sentence.

1. *The Subjunctive.*

The following general remark may be made with regard to employment of the subjunctive after verbs introducing the indirect declarative sentence: The subjunctive is most consistently used after verbs of thinking and believing [Class B], and of petition and command [Class A, 2]; it varies considerably with the indicative after verbs of simple report [Class A, 1]; and is found least of all after verbs of direct perception [Class C].

There are two varieties of subjunctives in indirect discourse; it is used (1) to denote mere report, (2) to express

design, futurity, uncertainty, and other similar ideas, either contained in the governing verb itself or proceeding from without and affecting both the principal and the subordinate clause. In the later periods of the language there is observable a growing tendency to make less and less use of the subjunctive and to substitute the indicative for it; this tendency, however, did not proceed to the same extent with the two varieties of subjunctives. The feeling against the employment of the subjunctive to express simple report grew strong in course of time, till in late Anglo-Saxon the indicative came to be regarded as the almost universal mood after simple verbs of saying; though there was considerable levelling of the subjunctives of the second kind under the indicative or the periphrastic forms, this tendency is by no means so marked as with subjunctives of simple report.

(*a*) *The Subjunctive of Simple Report.* The subjunctive is frequently employed, especially after verbs of Class A, 1, to signify that the statement made is merely a report, and there is generally combined with this the stronger moment of subjectivity by which the speaker is unwilling to guarantee the correctness of the report, as, *e. g.*, *Or.*, 36, 12, be þam Theuhalion wæs gecweden þæt he *wære* moncynnes to-driend; *CP.*, 71, 2, hie sædon þæt hie *wæren* wiese; 415, 14, hit is awriten þæt Dina *wære* utgangende. These verbs (*cweðan, secgan* and *awritan*) are followed very consistently by the subjunctive in the Alfredian period, but there is a general transition to the indicative in the later language. The subjunctive is also found with greater or less regularity after the other verbs of this class, as *sprecan, Or.*, 48, 25; *rædan, AH.*, I, 152, 3; *andettan, AH.*, I, 116, 23. Owing to the strongly objective character of *cyðan* the following indirect statement is mostly in the indicative; yet there are occasional instances of the subjunctive of report, as *AH.*, I, 128, 10, cyðdon þæt his sunu gesund *wære.*

Among the great number of indicative constructions after verbs of perception there are a few scattered examples of the

subjunctive of report, as *BH.*, 117, 25, we leorniað þæt seo tid *sie* toþæs degol; this is most frequent after *hieran*, as *Or.*, 138, 18; *Byr.*, 117. In the following examples it is probable that a feeling for some expression of possible doubt contributed to the employment of the subjunctive, in addition to the attraction to a subjunctival form in the governing clause: *LS.*, 250, 193, þæt men oncnawon þæt we *beon* gehealdene; *BH.*, 145, 8, ne sy eow nænigu cearo þæt ge geseon þæt þeos eadige Maria *sy* geceged to deaðe.

In late Anglo-Saxon, owing to the prevalence of the indicative, the use of the subjunctive is a strong indication that the speaker does not give his warrant to the statement, as *John*, VIII, 54, be þam ge cweðað þæt he *sy* ure God; similarly *Matt.*, XXVII, 64; *Mark*, XII, 18; *John*, IX, 19; *AH.*, II, 234, 4, 9. Especially is this the case with *leogan*, as *AH.*, I, 378, 7, untwylice þu lyhst þæt þu God *sy*. In some instances, as in *Boe.*, 210, 4, a true and a false statement are contrasted by the use of the indicative and of the subjunctive respectively: ne cweþe ic þæt þæt yfel *sy;* ac ic cweþe þæt hit *is* betere, þæt man wrege, etc.

As the subjunctive of simple report is evidently a modification of the subjunctive of subjective reflection, it is interesting to notice the various degrees of probability set forth by this mood. In a passage like *AH.*, I, 116, 19, wiðsocon þæt he deadlic flæsc *underfenge*, the subjunctive expresses what is in the opinion of the speaker a downright falsehood; then, as is well illustrated by the constructions after *secgan* in the Voyages of Othere and Wulfstan [*Bright's Anglo-Saxon Reader*, p. 38 ff.], this mood serves to make reports, the certainty of which is not vouched for by the writer: he sæde þæt Norðmanna land *wære* swyðe lang and swyþe smæl; finally, as is abundantly seen in the numerous scriptural quotations introduced by *awritan*, the subjunctive serves no other purpose than to indicate mere indirect quotation; the subjective element of doubt is here at its weakest, for the Anglo-Saxon translator

of the *Pastoral Care* is too good a churchman to permit us to question his belief in Holy Writ.

(*b*) *The Subjunctive due to the nature of the governing verb.*

(1) The subjunctive indicates an expression of the will contained in verbs of command, advice, admonition, and the like. This variety of the subjunctive is almost always found after verbs of Class A, 2, as *gelæran*, *Or.*, 124, 2, he gelærde ealle Crecas þæt hie Alexandre *wiðsocen;* similarly after *swerian*, *Or.*, 190, 22; *clypian*, *AH.*, I, 425, 33; *geleornian*, *CP.*, 32, 22; *manian*, 191, 12; *healsian*, *Bede*, 372, 7; *tican*, *gesettan*, *warnian*, etc. As most of the verbs of Class A, 1 have the force of commands besides their usual signification of simple utterance, they are also followed by this subjunctive, as *AH.*, I, 166, 13, cweð to þisum stanum þæt hi *beon* awende to hlafum; similarly after *cyðan*, *CP.*, 189, 1; after *secgan*, 215, 6.

(2) Closely related to the use of the subjunctive in expressions of the will is its use in expressions of design or intention. When the idea of design is not present in the governing verb (as with simple verbs of saying), it is generally expressed by the use of the periphrastic construction with *willan* in the dependent clause; but after verbs of design the simple subjunctive is generally employed, though the moment of intention is frequently emphasized by the use of *willan: AH.*, I, 484, 6, we sculon hogian þæt we simle ðone maran gylt *forfleon* þurh aitfere; *Or.*, 188, 13, þencende þæt he hine *beswice;* likewise with *hycgan*, *Gen.*, 297; *secan*, *John*, VII, 4; *smeagan*, *Mark*, XII, 12.

(3) As the subjunctive is the regular expression of contingency or uncertainty, it is the favorite mood after verbs of thinking and believing [Class B], where in general the event narrated in the dependent sentence is future with reference to the action of the governing verb. The subjunctive is, therefore, used with almost entire exclusion of the indicative after *wenan*, *ondrædan*, *þyncan*, *gyman*, *geornian*, and the like; as *Or.*, 104, 27, on þam tohopan þæt hie symle siðe God þonan *ado* to heora agnum lande; *AH.*, II, 310, 28, þæt he truwode

on God þæt he *wære* acyrred. When future action is expressed in past time, the subjunctive is frequent after all verbs, as *BH.*, 159, 26, wæs cweðende þæt his sæd *oferweoxe* ealle þas worulde; similarly after *cyðan*, *LS.*, 174, 89; *gesweotolian*, *AH.*, I, 564, 22. After *gelyfan*, although the subjunctive is the usual construction, the indicative is used to record belief in an established doctrine; compare *CP.*, 111, 11, with *AH.*, I, 26, 8 [see *geliefan*]. Quite a number of governing verbs have a double meaning, according to the mood and tense of the dependent verb; as *geðencan* with the meaning of design followed by the subjunctive of the dependent verb, as *Matt.*, VI, 27, mæg geðencan þæt he *geeacnige* ane elne to his anlicnesse; but with the meaning of simple remembrance, when followed by the present or past indicative, as *Matt.*, V, 23, þu þær geðencest þæt þin broðor *hæfð* ænig þing agen þe; *CP.*, 53, 17, is to geðencenne þæt he *underfeng* martyrdom. In like manner compare *gemunan* with the subjunctive in *BH.*, 73, 26, with the same verb followed by the indicative in *Boe.*, 164, 18.

(*c.*) The subjunctives of the third class are due to other causes than the direct influence of the governing verb. Although subject to some variation, the subjunctive is used when moments of interrogation, negation, condition, concession, and the like, enter into the expression, either in connection with the main clause or in the dependent sentence; as *Boe.*, 208, 8, hwæðer þu ongite þæt ælc yfelwillende mon *sie* wites wyrðe?; *LS.*, 502, 542, ic næfre gyt nyste þæt ænig oþer byrig us *wære* gehende; *El.*, 441, gif þæt gelimpe on lifdagum þæt þu *gehyre* frode frignan; *Boe.*, 242, 6, ic wat gif se delfere þa eorðan na ne dulfe, þonne ne *funde* he hit no; *W.*, 227, 8, þeh hwam gebyrige þæt his fyr ut *gewite*; *Boe.*, 160, 2, ær þu me gerehtest þæt þæt *wære* soð God; similarly *CP.*, 119, 13; 195, 15; 199, 7; 285, 3; 341, 1; *Boe.*, 16, 31; 34, 11; 210, 8; *W.*, 3, 3; 273, 11; *AH.*, II, 234, 12; *Bede*, 374, 26; *BH.*, 181, 3; *Matt.*, XXIV, 43; *Luke*, XII, 36; *An.*, 714. It is more than probable that in many cases attraction to a subjunctive in the governing clause has exercised considerable influence in the

employment of the like mood in the dependent clause, as *AH.*, 1, 328, 26, gif hit gylt nære þonne ne *geswutelode* þæt halige godspel þæt he *wære* mid purpuran geglencged.

A less frequent use of the subjunctive is to express a simple assumption; this is seen in its most common form after the introductory expression *þæt is* common in the *Cura Past.;* as 383, 4, þæt is þæt mon his sweord *doo* ofer his hype þæt mon his lare *læte;* 9, ðæt is ðæt mon *ierne* ðurh midde þa ceastre, ðætte mon swa emn *sie* betweox cristenum folce. Closely connected with this is the employment of the subjunctive to express indefinite action, as is well illustrated by its use after *ðeaw* instead of the regular indicative, as *Wand.*, 11, ic wat þæt bið on eorle ðeaw þæt he his ferd-lucan fæste *binde.*

A distinction is to be observed between the subjunctives of this kind and those previously considered; while the latter are to be found only after special classes of verbs, the former may occur after all introductory expressions; its use is however most clearly marked after verbs of direct perception, since these have least subjective color and the passage of the subjunctive idea from the main to the subordinate clause is more distinctly observable.

2. *The Indicative.*

(*a*) Verbs of saying, reporting, and the like [Class A, 1] are in the writings of the Alfredian period generally followed by the indicative only when the event recorded is presented in an emphatic and objective manner; hence the variation is use of mood after *cweðan*, *secgan*, etc. By the time of Ælfric, however, the levelling influence of the indicative has made considerable progress, so that there is a noticeable use of this mood where the subjunctive would have been required at an earlier period; to this tendency rather than to the simple objectivity of statement are due the numerous instances of the indicative after verbs of simple report in late Anglo-Saxon.

Some of these verbs, however, have an inherent power of emphasizing the reality of the statements they record and are

generally followed by the indicative; such are *cyðan, tacnian, sweotolian, gereccan,* and *bodian;* as *CP.*, 409, 19, mid ðæm worde he cyðde ðæt hit *is* se hiehsta cræft; similarly 295, 23; *Beow.*, 1973; *AH.*, I, 116, 9; 246, 16; *Boe.*, 160, 1.

The indicative is often found in the dependent clause after verbs which require the subjunctive, when this clause is separated from the governing verb by another clause, since the subordinating force of the leading verb is in this way apparently weakened, as *Boe.*, 140, 15, ic ær sæde þæt sio soðe gesælþ *wære* God and of þære soðan gesælþ *cumeð* eall þa oðre god; similarly *BH.*, 29, 15; *AH.*, I, 532, 29; *CP.*, 107, 18.

After verbs of command and petition [Class A, 2] the indicative is seldom found; in most of its occurrences it denotes the result of an action prompted by the will, as *BH.*, 191, 13, me bædon and lærdon Romane þæt ic *gewat* heonan onweg; *Beow.*, 1662, me geuðe þæt ic on wæge *geseah* wlitig hangian eald sweord eacen; 2873, him god uðe þæt he him sylfum *gewræc* ana mid ecge; similarly *AH.*, II, 594, 15; *Or.*, 148, 4; 262, 19.

An indicative is occasionally set over against a subjunctive to distinguish a true from a false statement; as *AH.*, I, 328, 18, ne sæde þæt halige godspell þæt se rica reafere *wære*, ac *wæs* uncystig; 364, 15, sume men cweðað þæt þu *sy* Iohannes, sume secgað þæt þu *sy* Helias—ic secge þæt þu *eart* stænen.

(*b*) After verbs of thinking and believing [Class B] the indicative is rarely found: after *wenan* in the first or second person to express the assurance of the truth of the conception in the mind of the thinker, as *Boe.*, 146, 29, wenst þu þætte ealle þa þing forði gode *sint* þy hi habbað? 16, 27; *AH.*, I, 580, 26,—after *gelyfan* to express an established doctrine, as *AH.*, I, 26, 8,—after *geðencan* in the sense of remembrance, as *CP.*, 53, 17. It is occasionally used after other verbs to emphasize the reality of a statement; it is very probably for this purpose that the indicative is used in *Boe.*, 164, 16, over against the usual subjunctive in 12: me þinceð þæt þu *hwerfest* sume wundorlice spræce—me þinceð þæt þu me *dwelige* and *dyderie.*

(*c*) After verbs of direct perception [Class C] the indicative is almost universal; in a very few cases the true subjunctive

of indirect report occurs [see *Subjunctive*]. When moments of condition, concession, and the like enter, the regular change of construction is required.

B. The Moods in the Indirect Interrogative Sentence.

The Indirect Interrogative Sentence is distinguished in two ways from the Indirect Declarative Sentence—by the introductory particle and by the mood in the dependent clause. Only the first distinction is consistently carried out. There is great irregularity in the use of mood. When the dependent clause is truly interrogative in character, the subjunctive is employed; in a large number of instances, however, the descriptive rather than the interrogative idea is present and hence in mood they do not differ from the corresponding declarative sentences; yet, in some cases, the interrogative construction of the dependent clause calls for the subjunctive, though there is little or no trace of any distinct interrogative idea. The broad statement may therefore be made that the employment of the subjunctive in the Indirect Interrogative Sentence is somewhat more extensive than in the Indirect Declarative Sentence.

The most practicable division of Indirect Interrogative Sentences with regard to the use of mood is a two-fold one: (1) Expressions in which the relation of the contents of the dependent clause to the principal is a matter of inquiry, so that either a positive or a negative answer is expected; such clauses are introduced by *gif* or *hwæðer;* (2) Expressions in which the dependent clause is introduced by interrogative pronouns, adverbs, or conjunctions.

1. *Interrogative Clauses introduced by Gif or Hwæðer.*

Gif corresponds in use both to Latin *si* and *num; hwæðer* corresponds in use to Latin *num* and in form to *utrum*, to which, according to Maetzner, it is also analogous from the

fact that it introduces a double question. When an alternative is expressed or implied, *hwæðer* is employed; in the simple question *hwæðer* and *gif* are used at pleasure.

The subjunctive is the usual mood in clauses introduced by *gif* and *hwæðer*. This is the universal construction after verbs of inquiry, as *LS.*, 76, 455, axode gif he *oncneowe* þæt gewrit; similarly after *axian hwæðer*, *LS.*, 104, 264; *gefandian hwæðer*, *Or.*, 164, 28; *befrignan gif*, *LS.*, 74, 410. In these expressions the interrogative idea in the dependent clause is at its highest point. It is often found after verbs of direct report; after *cweðan* the clause introduced by *hwæðer* answers to the Latin indirect question introduced by *numquid*, as *John*, VII, 26, cweðe we *hwæðer hi ongyten* [numquid cognoverunt]; it often happens that the governing verb is not present and the expression corresponds to the Latin direct question introduced by *an* or *num*, as *Boe.*, 120, 6, hwæðer þu ongite? [an causas deprehendisti?]. Other examples after verbs of this class are *LS.*, 494, 116, gehwa moste cyðan *hwæðer him leofre wære; secgan gif*, *Matt.*, XXVI, 63. This construction follows some verbs of thinking, as *gieman hwæðer*, *Mark*, III, 2; *tweon hwæðer*, *W.*, 2, 5; 196, 11; *BH.*, 205, 9, etc. It is also quite frequent after verbs of perception, as *witan hwæðer*, *LS.*, 256, 293; *oncnawan hwæðer*, *LS.*, 534, 743.

The indicative is occasionally used with *gif* or *hwæðer;* as after *geseon gif*, *CP.*, 157, 16; *geseon hwæðer*, *AH.*, II, 414, 19. In *AH.*, I, 532, 25, he nat hwæðer he wurðe *is* into þam ecan rice, absolute ignorance is thus predicated; so with *cunnan*, *Beow.*, 1356, ne hire fæder cunnon hwæðer him ænig *wæs* ær acenned dyrnra gasta; it is also used when complete knowledge of a fact is indicated, as *AH.*, II, 228, 22, he gecnæwð hwæðer he *is* of Gode. The indicative is found after *smeagan* with the meaning 'to consider,' when there is a tacit assumption of the reality of the contents of the clause, as *AH.*, II, 228, 22, smeage gehwa gif þa beboda *habbaþ* ænigne stede on his heortan. The rare instance of an indicative after *axian* in *Mark*, X, 2, is due to the influence of the Latin: hine axodon

hwæþer *alyfð* ænegum men his wif forlætan [interrogabant eum: si licet]. When an alternative is expressed or implied the subjunctive is always found, as *LS.*, 256, 293, nyte we hwæðer se weardman *wære* æfre gefullod [compare *AH.*, I, 532, 25, above]; *John*, VII, 17, he gecnæwð hwæðer he *sy* of Gode, þe ic be me sylfum *spece* [compare *AH.*, II, 228, 22, above].

2. *Interrogative Clauses introduced by a Pronomial.*

General observations—When the interrogative idea is prominent in the dependent clause the subjunctive is used, irrespective of the character of the governing verb; as *Bede*, 178, 1, hwelc þæs cyninges geleafa *wære* þæt æfter his deaðe wæs geeyðed; similarly after *ætiewan*, *Bede*, 292, 33; *witan*, *CP.*, 427, 21; *Boe.*, 46, 7; *gehieran*, *AH.*, I, 280, 2; *behealdan*, *Bede*, 288, 14; *understandan*, *AH.*, I, 214, 1. This interrogative construction also seems to favor a ready passage to the subjunctive when negative, interrogative, and similar ideas enter the expression; as, in a negative sentence, *El.*, 860, ne meahte hire Judas geeyðan on hwylene se hælend ahafen *wære;* after a final expression in *CP.*, 75, 7, þæt he ongite for hwæs geðyncðum ðæt folc *sie* genemned heord; in a conditional sentence, *Bede*, 328, 19; *John*, VII, 51; *Luke*, VII, 39, etc. The subjunctive seems frequently to be due simply to the interrogative form alone, as *AH.*, I, 50, 36, is geswutelod hu miclum *fremige* þære soðan lufe gebed.

In most cases, however, the predicative idea is predominant and the indicative is the usual mood, as is often seen after *awritan* when this construction is employed not in its interrogative but in its highly descriptive character; this is specially observable after strong objective expressions as *gereccan*, *CP.*, 333, 16, and *bodian*, *CP.*, 163, 1, and after such verbs as *læran*, *W.*, 242, 13, and *rædan*, *LS.*, 426, 202, with the signification of simple verbs of saying.

These constructions may be divided into two classes:—

a. Indirect interrogative sentences introduced by pronouns or adjectives, as *hwa, hwæs, hwam, hwæt, hwilc, hwæðer*, etc.

After verbs of inquiry the subjunctive is the rule, as *LS.*, 10, 9, þa iudeiscan axodon crist hwæt he *wære;* similarly *axian hwa, AH.*, I, 152, 14; *frignan hwæt, LS.*, 174, 76.

After verbs of the other classes the subjunctive is employed when regularly required by the governing verb or when the interrogative idea is prominent in the clause, as *CP.*, 273, 5, þæt hie geðencen hwelce hi hie innan *geemigen* Gode; similarly *geseon hwilcne, AH.*, I, 580, 29; *secgan hwæt, AH.*, I, 386, 13. This mood is also used when the reality of the contents of the dependent clause is doubted, or when its action is regarded as indefinite or uncertain, either in present or in future time, as *Mark*, XV, 24, hi hlotu wurpon hwæt gehwa *name*. It is often due to the negative, conditional, or adhortative character of the expression, as *Matt.*, VI, 3, nyte þin wynstre hwæt *do* þin swyðre; *Luke*, VII, 39, gyf þe man witega wære he wiste hwæt and hwylc þis wif *wære*.

In most cases, however, the indicative is found when it is the regular sequence of the governing verb, and oftentimes the interrogative pronomial is scarcely to be distinguished from a relative, as *Boe.*, 88, 2, ic wylle gecyðan mid hwilcere endebyrdnesse he *gestaðolað; CP.*, 401, 15, ic eow secge hwæt eow arwyrðlicost *is* to beganne; 429, 24, hi ongietað hwæt ymbe hi gedon *bið;* similarly *cyðan hwæðer, Or.*, 100, 8; *geðencan hwæt, CP.*, 37, 23; *witan hwelc, Or.*, 136, 20. "Es ist ersichtlich," says Mätzner [*Engl. Gram.*, III, 443], "wie nahe bisweilen der Fragesatz an dem relativen Satz streift; die Entscheidung liegt in dem Prädicatsbegriffe des Hauptsatzes und ist auf die Analogie mit der Satzfrage zu begründen."

b. Indirect interrogative sentences introduced by interrogative adverbs, such as *hwonne, hwær, hwonan, hwider, humeta, hwi, hu.*

The same rules apply in general to these expressions.

The regular subjunctive follows verbs of inquiry, as *AH.*, I, 18, 12, axode hwi he his bebod *tobræce: axian hu, AH.*, I, 182, 19; *befrignan hwær, AH.*, I, 78, 11.

The subjunctive occurs after other verbs when the interrogative idea is specially strong, as *Or.*, 260, 6, gesecge hwær ænig gewin swa *gehwurfe;* also *CP.*, 433, 14,—in indefinite or assumed expressions, as *CP.*, 45, 24, þenceaþ . . . . hwi hie ðara geearnunga bet *truwigen* ðonne; *Matt.*, XXIV, 3,—in a conditional or concessive sentence as *John*, XI, 57, hæfdon beboden gif hwa wiste hwær he *wære*,—after verbs which usually require the subjunctive, as *ðencan hu*, *CP.*, 41, 23; *smeagan hu*, *AH.*, II, 268, 7.

The indicative is in general use after verbs of report and of perception; here the interrogative idea is almost lost sight of and the attention is directed rather to the adverbial relation, as *CP.*, 225, 23, gif he him sægð hwonon ðæt *cymð;* similarly *CP.*, 163, 11; 419, 10; *Or.*, 24, 21; 210, 27; *LS.*, 302, 281; *Jud.*, 174.

The frequent use of the indirect interrogative clause introduced by *hu* deserves special notice; in most of these examples the attention is directed not so much to the interrogative relation, as to the manner of action or the simple occurrence of the event; as we should expect, therefore, the indicative is the mood employed; as *CP.*, 163, 11, he him gecyðð *hu* sio byrðen *wiexð* and *hefegað; LS.*, 302, 281, ne mæg man awritan *hu* oft se ælmihtiga God egelice *gewræc* his foresewennysse; similarly after *secgan*, *Or.*, 24, 21; *sweotolian*, *AH.*, I, 272, 22; *smeagan*, *AH.*, I, 308, 19; *ongietan*, *CP.*, 231, 16; *oncnawan*, *AH.*, I, 588, 8; *gemunan*, *CP.*, 5, 8.

A large number of these *hu*-clauses differ very little from the simple dependent sentence introduced by *þæt* and sometimes even seem to replace the latter, as *LS.*, 10, 11, nu ge habbað gehered *hu* se hælend be him spræc. The two constructions are occasionally found side by side, as *Jos.*, II, 10, we gehierdon *þæt* Drihten adrigde þa readan sæ and *hu* ge ofslogen siððan twegen cyningas; *Chr.*, 58, C. 20, cydde *hu* his breðre hæfdon wroht an minstre and *þæt* hi hæfdon gefrerd wið cyning; *AH.*, II, 486, 25, to secganne *hu* Adam wearð on Deofles ðeowdome gebroht and *þæt* se mildheorta God forgeaf þam mannum þe

hine ænne wurðiað; similarly in *Luke*, VII, 39, he wiste *hwelc* and *hwæt* þis wif wære, *þæt* heo synful is; also *LS.*, 28, 77.

By a careful comparison of the *hu*-clauses with the indirect declarative sentence introduced by *þæt*, it will be found that the two constructions are not used indiscriminately: *hu* has a definite sylistic value; it is the concrete, vivid introduction as opposed to the colorless *þæt*. In the words of Mätzner (*Engl. Gram.*, III, 445), "Jenes (*þæt*) fasst einfach die Thatsache zusammen, während dieses (*hu*) malerich an den sinnfälligen Verlauf oder die Weise der Thatsache erinnert." From a rhetorical standpoint, therefore, the construction introduced by *hu* is a most important means of graphic and picturesque representation and the frequency of its employment in Anglo-Saxon attests the value set upon it as a stylistic device. It is a common construction at all periods of the language, but the translator of the *Pastoral Care* shows a peculiar fondness for its use, especially when he exercises his power of description; how vivid a picture does he in this way present to us of the gladsome days of old in England: ic geseah *hu* þa ciricean giond eall Angelcynn stodon madma and boca gefylde [*CP.*, 5, 8]; me com swiðe oft on gemynd *hwelce* wiotan iu wæron giond Angelcynn, and *hu* gesæliglica tida ða wæron giond Angelcynn; and *hu* þa kyningas Gode and his ærendwrecum hersumedon; and *hu* him ða gespeow ægðer ge mid wige ge mid wisdome; and eac ða godcundan hadas *hu* georne hie wæron; and *hu* man utanbordes wisdom and lare hieder on lond sohte, and *hu* we hie ne sceoldon ute begietan gif we hie habban sceoldon [*CP.*, 3, 2 ff.].

IV. The Use of the Auxiliaries.

Sculan.

The original signification of *sculan* was a sense of duty. This original conception has suffered considerable transferrence in

meaning, until there remains only the idea of compulsion which easily passes over to that of cause, of occasion, and even of possibility.[1]

The signification of duty or obligation in *sculan* is very strong in Anglo-Saxon; indeed there are few instances of its occurrence where this idea is not present to a greater or less extent; it is found after verbs of all classes, as *CP.*, 55, 19, he þenceð þæt he *sciele* monig god weorc þæron wyrcan; *W.*, 298, 2, nyte ge ful georne þæt ælc mon *scel* hyran his hlaforde?; similarly after *secgan*, *AH.*, II, 604, 22; *gesweotolian*, *AH.*, I, 382, 17; *þyncan*, *CP.*, 57, 7; *gehieran*, *AH.*, II, 544, 27; *geleornian*, *Bede*, 76, 7.

The conception of duty imposed upon one by a person other than the subject of *sculan* is found in expressions in which the governing verb denotes command, prohibition, or admonition, as *Or.*, 44, 8, het secgan þæt hie *sceoldon* þæt land æt him alesan; similarly after *beodan*, *AH.*, I, 246, 20, bead þæt ælc man swa don *sceolde;* after *cweðan*, *AH.*, I, 424, 9; *awritan*, *AH.*, I, 174, 20; *gesettan*, *AH.*, I, 150, 21; *gelæran*, *CP.*, 131, 3; *hatan*, *LS.*, 200, 92; *manian*, *CP.*, 97, 11. It is the common construction after such expressions in the indirect interrogative sentence, as *AH.*, II, 250, 4, wolde him æteowian hu he oðrum *sceolde* mannum gemiltsian on mislicum gyltum; *CP.*, 169, 20, Dryhten bebead Moyse hu he *scolde* beran þa earc; similarly after *reccan*, *CP.*, 73, 22; *anstellan*, *W.*, 218, 28; *gestihtan*, *CP.*, 99, 11; *getacnian*, *Bede*, 90, 5; *rædan*, *Chr.*, 246, C. 22. *Sculan* is also frequent in threats, as *Gu.*, 163, hwearfum cwædon þæt he on þam beorge byrnan *sceolde.*

From this idea of compulsion advance is made to that of the necessary occurrence of an event by reason of this exercise of force; hence *sculan* is used to express absolute certainty in future time and, as closely connected with this, is frequent in indirect expressions of prophesy; as *LS.*, 446, 97, þam wearð

[1] Von Monsterberg Münckenau, "Der Infinitiv nach *Wellen* u s w. in den Epen Hartmanns von Aue," *Z. f. d. Phil.*, 18, 148 ff.

geswutelod on swefne þæt he *sceolde* gefeccan æt Swyðunes byrgene his lichaman hæle; 152, 79, ic secge þæt þu *scealt* gewitan on þam sixteodan geare; *Or.*, 80, 35, we witan þæt we ure agen lif forlætan *sceolon;* likewise after *cweðan*, *CP.*, 329, 8; *cyðan*, *AH.*, I, 152, 19; *secgan*, *BH.*, 69, 18.

There is considerable difference of opinion with regard to the power of *sculan* to form periphrastic expressions of the future. Koch [*Engl. Gram.*, II, p. 31] holds that *sculan* with the infinitive was used as an expression of future time earlier than *willan* and infinitive, and that the former construction places itself alongside the simple present as a representative of the future in Anglo-Saxon. Mätzner [*Engl. Gram.*, I, 348], with his usual caution, does not go so far and only states that the use of *sculan* with the infinitive approaches very near a periphrastic expression of the future. Ælfric does not afford us much assistance here, though he shows that there was a distinct difference between the simple indicative and the auxiliary constructions, when he distinguishes *stabo* = *ic stande nu rihte oððe sumne timan* from *loquaturus* = *se þe wyle oððe sceal sprecan.* Lüttgens inclines to the belief that Ælfric here uses the auxiliaries to denote the various circumstances contained in the sentence which lead up to the event, and sums up his conclusions thus (p. 48): "lässt sich sagen dass dann wenn der Gedanke des Lesers der zukünftigen Handlung gilt, zu welcher Vorstellung er in Zusammenhang Veranlassung verschiedener Art findet, sich auch das futurische Moment in *sculan* geltend macht, dass *sculan* in solchen Fällen aber dann einer futurischen Umschreibung sehr nahe zu kommen scheint, wenn das Moment der Nötigung weniger beachtet zu werden verdient und kaum noch hervortritt." There are numerous examples of such expressions as *Bede*, 198, 9, ic ongeote þæt he hrædlice of þissum life leoran *sceal;* 188, 14, he seolfa onget þæt hine mon ofslean *sceolde;* similarly *Or.*, 86, 3; *AH.*, I, 152, 8; *CP.*, 93, 4. Most if not all of these statements lie on the border-line between prophecies and simple future expressions. After most verbs, ideas of necessity, com-

mand, and prophecy find so easy an entrance that it is impossible to state with any degree of certainty whether the construction with *sculan* represents these or the future conception. After verbs of thinking and believing [Class B] these ideas are more generally absent and we may speak with more assurance of the clear expression of futurity. In sentences like the following, then, there is the nearest approach to the modern periphrastic construction of the future: *CP.*, 433, 28, he gesihð þa gearwe ðe he wende þæt he *sceolde* ungearwe findan; *AH.*, I, 294, 1, we sceolon gelyfan þæt ælc lichama *sceal* arisan; *BH.*, 183, 31, wenstu þæt ic *sceole* sprecan to þissum men? similarly *W.*, 126, 18; 152, 20; *CP.*, 5, 22.

The construction with *sculan* used as a periphrastic expression for the subjunctive is rarely found except after verbs of design [Lüttgens, p. 18], as *CP.*, 41, 23, Þonne hie þenceað hu hi sylfe *scylen* fullfremodeste weorðan; similarly *Or.*, 216, 15.

A greater degree of development has taken place in the signification of *sculan* when used after expressions of custom; the primitive idea in this connection is evidently the obligation resting upon one to conform to a practice that has been sanctioned by continuous usage; hence the construction with *sculan* has come to be a common method of describing in detail a rite or custom, as *Matt.*, XXVII, 15, hig hæfdon heom to gewunan þæt se dema *sceolde* forgyfan þam folce ænne forwyrhtne mann; *AH.*, I, 218, 1, se gewuna stent þæt se sacerd bletsian *sceole* palm twiga. In the lengthy narration of a custom, *sculan* is inserted at intervals within the regular direct indicative narration, as *Bright's Anglo-Saxon Reader*, p. 43 [*Or.*, 20, 19], þæt is mid Estum þeaw þonne þær bið man dead, þæt he bið unforbærned and þa cyningas licgað bufan eorðan on hyra husum; and ealle þa hwile þær *sceal* beon gedrywe; þonne todæleð hi his feoh and alecgað hit on anre mile þone mæstan dæl from þæm tune; and *sceall* beon se læsta dæl nyhst þæm tune; þonne *sceolon* beon gesamnode ealle þa men . . . . and þæt is mid Estum þeaw þæt þær *sceall* ælces geðeodes man beon for-

bærned; and gif þar man an ban findeð unforbærned hi hit *sceolon* gebetan, etc.; similarly *Or.*, 70, 23.

There is another peculiar use of *sculan*, viz., in statements, the truth of which the writer or speaker will not vouch for, and, in some instances, in statements which he considers absolutely false. This use of *sculan* grows out of its subjective nature. The construction is not very common, but is occasionally found in most Anglo-Saxon prose writings; as *CP.*, 91, 8, sio godcunde stefn cwæð þæt hie *sceolden* leasunga witgian [quas divinus sermo falsa videre redarguit]; 431, 15, sæde Solomon þæt se mon *sceolde* cweðan; *Or.*, 206, 3, sume men sædon þæt he *sceolde* beon gefongen on hergunga oþþe æt wearde; *AH.*, I, 486, 5, sume gedwolmen cwædon þæt þæt heafud *sceolde* ablawan ðæs cyninges wif; *W.*, 197, 16,[1] ealle þa þe hæþene men cwædon þæt godas beon *sceoldan; AH.*, 572, 16,[1] sume gedwolmen cwædon þæt seo halige Maria and sume oðre halgan *sceolon* hergian ða synfuldan of þam deofle; *Boe.*, 194, 30, ongunnon lease men wyrcan spell and rædon þæt hio *sciolde* mid hyre drycræft þa men forbædon; sume hi rædon þæt hio *sciolde* forsceoppan; *LS.*, 526, 613, cwæð þæt þær gelæht wære binnan þære byrig an uncuð geong man þe yldrena gold hord *sceolde* findan; similarly *Bede*, 438, 32, gesegen wæs þæt he heora aldor beon *sceolde* [major esse videbatur eorum]; *Chr.*, 315, E, 19.

When the writer is narrating an extended story of this kind, he guards it either by the employment of *sculan* with every clause, as *Boe.*, 162, 4, ic wat þæt þu gehierdest oft reccan on ealdrum leasum spellum þæt Job *sceolde* beon se hehsta god, and he *sceolde* beon þæs heofones sunu, and *scolde* ricsian on heofonum and *sceolden* gigantas beon on eorðan sume, and *sceolden* ricsian ofen eorðan and þa *sceolden* hi beon

[1] These examples are cited by Lüttgens, p. 19, bb. as *Bede*, 495 and 196 respectively; the edition of the *Ecclesiastical History* he has used is that of Wheeloc, who has inserted parts of Anglo-Saxon homilies at frequent intervals in the historical narrative. It is in these interpolations that this construction with *sculan* occurs. *Bede* offers no instances of this construction after a verb of saying.

swilce hi wæron geswystrena bearn forðam þe he *sceolde* beon heofones sunu, etc.; or, more frequently, there is variation with the direct narration in the indicative, as in the well-known passage in the *Boethius*, 168, 3, þa sædon hi þæt þæs hearperes wif *sceolde* acwellan and hire sawle man *sceolde* lædan to helle; þa *sceolde* se hearpere weorþan swa sarig, *teah* to wuda and *sæt* and *weop* and *hearpode* . . . . þa he þider com, þa *sceolde* cuman þære helle hund, etc. The original Latin is expressed in indirect discourse throughout. *Sculan* is therefore used here as a note of warning against the reader's belief in this narrative which the author afterwards characterizes as 'þas leasan spell.' In *Boe.*, 194, 13 ff., *sculan* is again used in the description of heathen belief; 13, licette þæt he *sceolde* beon se hehsta God; 16, þa *sceolde* þæs Jobes fæder beon eac God; similarly 19, 20, 29, 32, 34. An interesting example of this use of *sculan* in later times is seen in *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, Act II, Sc. 2, "Tib hath tickled in Gammer's ear that you *should* steal the cock;" also in *As You Like It*, iii, 2, 182.

Sculan is occasionally used to express simple report in direct discourse; as *W.*, 221, 24, he sende þa birnende regn ofer manna bearn; þa *scoldon* hie swiðe nioh mid ealle forweorþan; *Beow.*, 1071, Hæleð Healfdena in Freawæle feallan *scolde;* 1261, Grendles modor seo þe wæter-egesan wunian *sceolde;* 2276, he gewunian *sceall* hræw under hrusan; similarly *Gen.*, 1776; *Gu.*, 75.

Willan.

The original idea contained in *willan* is that of volition; although this primitive meaning has remained to a greater or less extent in almost every occurrence of *willan*, there has been a strong development in the use of this auxiliary. Simple volition has developed into the stronger moment of intention and design, and expresses the subjective element in a promise; on the other hand, with a weakening of its original force, *willan*

is used to indicate future action and also to express prophetic utterances. Finally, it denotes a long-continued tendency toward a certain course of action, hence a habit or custom.

The use of *willan* to express a wish pure and simple is not very frequent in indirect discourse, since the other meanings of this auxiliary easily enter in to modify the statement. Some clear examples are, however, found, as *AH.*, I, 136, 2, hit is awriten þæt fela witegan *woldon* geseon Cristes to-cyme; *LS.*, 406, 372, sæde þæt he *wolde* hine wurðian for god; *AH.*, II, 298, 31, cwædon þæt hi *woldon* his lare gehyran; *Bede*, 438, 7, cwæð þæt he *nolde* his synna ondettan [respondit non se velle confiteri peccata sua].

The idea of volition necessarily contains in itself the element of futurity, and the moment of design is quite frequently subordinated to that of future occurrence. The less the original meaning of *willan* is felt, so much the more forcible becomes the future idea in the expression. The entire elimination of the element of volition in *willan* is very rare, but in not a few instances it has become so weak that the simple future character of the expression can hardly admit of doubt; as *AH.*, II, 482, 31, cyðað þe þæt ða Iudeiscan *willað* beon eowere gafolgylderas; *Or.*, 80, 20, write þæt hie *woldon* geornfulran beon þære wrace þonne oþere men; *CP.*, 257, 25, is awriten þæt sio wund *wolde* haligean æfter þæm þe hio wyrsmde; *Beow.*, 13 15, þær se snotora bad hwæðer him alwalda æfre *wille* æfter weaspelle wyrpe gefremman; similarly *CP.*, 57, 22; 387, 26; *Or.*, 76, 10; 136, 12; *Boe.*, 76, 22; *BH.*, 135, 4, 21; *AH.*, I, 480, 1.

Examples are far more numerous in which *willan* serves to express intermediate ideas between mere volition on the one hand and the simple future on the other. Most closely connected with the moment of volition is the use of *willan* with expressions of promise or threat, where this auxiliary is most frequently employed, as *AH.*, II, 26, 9, cwæð þæt he on Gode gelyfan *wolde; Gen.*, 47, cwædon þæt heo rice agan *woldon; LS.*, 416, 51, cwæð þæt he nolde his hæsum gehyrsumian; *W.*,

216, 8, Drihten self wrat þæt he *wolde* ealle synfulle men forbærnan; *AH.*, I, 22, 8, þa behet God þæt he *wolde* næfre eft eal mancynn mid wætre acwellan; similarly after *gebeodan*, *Or.*, 54, 21; *swerian*, 68, 27; *gebeotian*, 72, 29; *gesprecan*, 138, 3; also *AH.*, II, 172, 9; 246, 5; 502, 7; *Bede*, 126, 19; *W.*, 206, 1; *Chr.*, 212, A. 24.

Closely allied in meaning to this use of *willan* is its use to denote intention or design, as *Matt.*, XXVI, 16, he smeade þæt he hine *wolde* belæwan; XXII, 15, þa ongunnon þa Pharisei rædan þæt hig *woldon* þone hælend on his spræce befon; similarly after *þencan*, *AH.*, I, 196, 2; *smeagan*, 206, 19. When the moment of intention is conveyed by a verb of simple report, *willan* is almost universally used in the dependent clause, as *AH.*, II, 504, 1, sæde þæt he *wolde* his wiðerwinna beon; *Beow.*, 199, cwæð he guðcyning ofer swanrade secan *wolde;* similarly after *secgan*, *Or.*, 136, 14.

The employment of this auxiliary in expressions of prophecy is very near to its use as a representative of the simple future, as *LS.*, 342, 85, hi ealle cyddon mid wordum þæt se wuldorfulla Hælend *wolde* us alesan fram helle; *W.*, 251, 1, sædon þæt se *wolde* cuman of þam cynestole hider on þas woruld; 206, 9, Noe hio mannum sæde be þam flode þæt he (= flod) *wolde* ealle synfulle men adrencan; *LS.*, 104, 240; *AH.*, I, 588, 25.

It is to be noted as a general observation that in expressions of intention and design or of simple volition, the person of both the subordinate and governing clauses is usually the same, since the sense of volition is strongest when the speaker expresses his own wishes; on the other hand, in future or prophetic statements the element of personality is obviously less prominent, and the persons of these two clauses are most frequently different.

The less common uses of *willan* are as follows:—

To express customary or habitual action, as *Bede*, 318, 14, secgað men be hire þæt heo næfre linnum hræglum brucan *wolde; AH.*, II, 552, 31, ic wat þæt þu eart swiðe styrne man

and *wilt* niman þæt þu ær ne sealdest, and *wilt* ripan þæt þu ær ne seowe; 138, 3, þes halga man wæs gewunod þæt he *wolde* gan on niht to sæ; *CP.*, 419, 26, is awriten þæt se hund *wille* etan þæt he ær aspaw, and sio sugu *wille* sylian on hire sole;[1] similarly *Beow.*, 988; *Or.*, 112, 19.

In clauses introduced by *hwæðer* after verbs of inquiry, *willan* expresses the idea of preference, as *AH.*, II, 50, 13, axodon hi hwæðer hi *wolden* wiðsacan defle; *BH.*, 233, 26, axa hie hwæðer hie *woldan* to eorðan astigan; *LS.*, 376, 172, he mot afandian hwæðer his mod *wille* abugan from Gode; similarly 338, 29.

In some instances *willan* has no more force than to express a courteous deference to the will of another, as *LS.*, 506, 300, we biddað þe, leof hlaford, þæt þu *gehyran wolde* (instead of the usual *gehyre*) ure word; 532, 732, ic bidde eow þæt ge æfter me ane lytle hwile *willen* gan.

The two following examples illustrate very well the ordinary distinctions between *sculan* and *willan: Or.*, 44, 8, het secgan þæt hie oðer *sceoldan* oððe þæt land æt him alesan, oððe he hi *wolde* fordon; *W.*, 99, 26, sædon þæt he þider upp astigan *wolde* and englas hine þær underfon *sceoldon.*

Motan and *Magan.*

There is great irregularity in the employment of these auxiliaries; in most cases they appear to be used merely to form periphrases of the simple subjunctive. *Motan*, however, is specially frequent after verbs of permission as *alyfan* and *forgiefan*, and together with *magan* is very common in expressions denoting future or designed action, as after *smeagan* and *geþeahtian.*

To determine the relative proportion of the simple subjunctive forms to the periphrastic constructions with *sculan, willan,*

[1] Lüttgens wrongly regards these as simple futures, p. 84.

motan, and *magan* in indirect discourse, the following statistics have been made:—

	CP.	*Or.*	*Boe.*	*Bede.*	*Poetry.*	*AH.*	*LS.*	*W.*	*BH.*	*Gosp.*
Subj.....	278	265	189	350	211	489	253	214	153	156
Auxil.....	90	92	68	138	122	300	169	111	72	16

The conclusions to be drawn from these statistics are very evident. With the exception of the poetical passages, in which the endeavor to impart vivacity and energy to the statement calls for a more extensive employment of the auxiliary constructions, and of the *Gospels* where the translator held slavishly to his Latin original, a remarkable regularity in use is observed. Regarding *CP.*, *Or.*, *Boe.*, and *Bede* as representatives of Alfredian prose and *AH.*, *Boe.*, *W.*, and *BH.* as types of the language of the later period, the above statistics show that the relative proportion of the subjunctive to the auxiliary forms in the former period is as 3 to 1, while at the time of Ælfric the proportion is as 2 to 1. This postulates, therefore, a growing tendency in the language to make use of the auxiliary constructions, and this tendency was fostered by the gradual breaking-down of the old subjunctive forms, until in course of time the periphrastic constructions almost entirely replaced the inflectional forms. The language of the poetry in the use of auxiliaries is almost identical with that of the period of Ælfric. The *Gospels*, in their almost entire neglect of the periphrastic forms, correspond to no other literary style.

V. The Complex Indirect Sentence.

The complex indirect sentence consists of a principal and of a subordinate clause, the latter of which is either adjectival

or adverbial in character. Of complex sentences the *conditional sentence* is by far the most important and requires special treatment.

A. The Indirect Conditional Sentence.

The indirect conditional sentence in Anglo-Saxon offers peculiar difficulties in its treatment. The sequence of tenses is here more rigidly observed than is generally the case with most dependent clauses, hence many of the distinctions which would otherwise be determined by means of the tense of the conditional clauses are hidden from view by reason of conformity to the tense of the governing verb; as, *e. g.*, the simple logical condition following a verb of past time is thrown into the same tense as the true ideal or unreal conditional clauses. Again, the distinctions established by differences in mood fall into more or less obscurity by reason of the frequent occurrences of the subjunctive as the regular sequence after many governing verbs; for this reason well defined examples of unreal and ideal conditions after verbs in past time are very rare and it is often almost impossible to distinguish the ideal from the logical condition.

The usual introduction of the protasis is *gif*, with frequent occurrences of *buton* and occasional instances of *nymðe*.

In considering the indirect conditional sentence, the treatment will be, as in the general discussion of the indirect sentence, a threefold one, according to the character of the governing verb. It will be seen, I think, that this principle of division will serve to bring out more clearly the peculiar constructions of the conditional clause falling under these respective classes. Dr. Mather has shown, in his dissertation on the *Conditional Sentence* [Munich, 1893], that there is a variation in the conditional construction according as the governing verb is in present or past time; this distinction has also been kept in view throughout the discussion.

1. *The Conditional Sentence after Verbs of Saying*, etc.

a. The governing verb in the present tense.

(1). After verbs of simple report—Here, as in the simple indirect sentences, are found variations in the use of moods.

(*a*) Indicative in apodosis and protasis: *CP.*, 233, 16, þæm æfstegum is to secganne gif he hie *nyllað* healdan wiþ þæm æfste þæt hie *weorðaþ* besewde; similarly *AH.*, II, 318, 4; *LS.*, 456, 244. In indirect interrogatives, as *Ælfric de Novo Test.*, 12, 5, ic secge hu gif þu *wiltest* ealne þisne wisdom þonne *woldest* þu gelyfan; likewise *CP.*, 53, 10; *W.*, 222, 13. In *John*, XII, 24, the protasis is in the invariable subjunctive after *buton:* ic secge eow þæt hwætene corn *wunaþ* ana buton hit *fealle* on eorðan.

(*b*) The subjunctive in the apodosis, the indicative remaining in the protasis, as *Boe.*, 212, 18, hi secgaþ þæt hi *mægen* þy ðe heora wisdome fylgan gif hiora anweald *biþ* fullice ofer þæt folc; similarly *Beow.*, 1846. The foregoing constructions are generally to be regarded as logical conditions.

(*c*) The protasis and apodosis are both with the subjunctive; the protasis generally expresses an ideal condition as, *CP.*, 73, 22, we willaþ reccan gif he þær swelc *tocyme* hu he þæron lybban *scyle;* similarly *Bede*, 128, 25; *CP.*, 253, 8, eac is to cyðanne ðam mettrumum, gif hie *willen* geliefan, þæt hie ðonne her on worulde ðoligen earfeðu; the unusual subjunctive in the apodosis in the last example expresses problematic action in the future. There are also a few clear cases of the unreal condition with the usual construction of the preterite subjunctive in both members: *W.*, 228, 7, ic sæcge þæt ge *scoldan* ealle forweorðan, *nære* þære halgan Scā Marian gebed; *Beow.*, 591, secge ic þe þæt næfre Grendel swa fela gryra *gefremede* gif þin hige *wære* sefa swa searo grim.

(2). After verbs of bidding, promising, and the like, the apodosis, following the general rule, requires the subjunctive; the mood of the protasis is frequently unaffected by that of the

apodosis and remains indicative, as in direct narration, as *LS.*, 478, 104, behat me gif þin dohter nu hal *biþ*, þæt þu hire *geþafige;* similarly *LS.*, 190, 353. In *LS.*, 6, 74, ic bidde nu on godes naman gif hwa þas boc awritan *wille*, þæt he hi wel *gerihte*, and *AH.*, II, 2, 20, the ambiguous form *wille* is used in the protasis; it is most probably to be regarded as subjunctive in a general and indefinite statement. In *Exod.*, 431, occurs the usual subjunctive protasis after *nymðe:* aþ swereþ þæt þines cynnes rim ne cunnon ylde nymðe hwylc þæs snottor in sefan *weorðe*.

b. The governing verb in past time.

The most noticeable difference between these and the preceding constructions consists in the greater regularity observed in the use of the preterite subjunctive in the protasis; the indicative is entirely done away with when the regular sequence of tenses is observed; the only exception is found when the indirect clause is thrown back into the present, in which case there is a distinct tendency to retain the direct expression, as *e. g.*, *Mark*, XII, 19, Moyses wrat, gif hwæs broðor dead *biþ* and *læfþ* his wif and *næfþ* nan bearn, þæt his broðor nime his wif. The corresponding passage in *Luke*, XX, 28, shows only a partial attraction of the verbs of the protasis: M. wrat gyf hwæs broðor *byþ* dead and wif *hæbbe* and se biþ butan bearnum, þæt his broðor *nime;* and this transition is complete in *Matt.*, XXII, 24, sæde gif hwa dead *sy* and bearn *næbbe*, þæt his broðor *nyme*, etc. The mood in the original Latin is the past subjunctive in all the cases, save 'non habens filium' (*Matt.*) and 'habens uxorem' (*Luke*).

The usual construction in the conditional sentence after a verb in past time is the use of the preterite subjunctive in both members of the sentence, as *Bede*, 374, 25, sægdon and cyðdon heora biscope þæt him *licede* and leof *wære* gif hit his willa *wære; CP.*, 63, 23, þæt he sceolde beodan Aron þæt nan man to his ðegnunge ne *come* gif he blind *wære;* similarly *CP.*, 96, 3; *Or.*, 194, 11; 266, 9; *Bede*, 122, 34; 126, 10; 234, 31; 242, 31, 33; 268, 15; 274, 29; 306, 24; 308, 19; 316, 21; 328,

19, 34; 332, 11; 390, 19; 416, 17; *Boe.*, 170, 10; 248, 8, 9; *AH.*, I, 134, 13; 138, 15; II, 18, 23; 178, 23; *Mark*, XIV, 33; *John*, IX, 22; *Gen.*, 1443; *Gu.*, 1131.

In many cases ambiguity arises by reason of the similar forms for the indicative and subjunctive of weak and auxiliary verbs; the auxiliaries may be generally regarded as used in their subjunctival modal function, and though we cannot speak with certainty with regard to the ambiguous forms of weak verbs, they at least offer no exception to the general usage; as *LS.*, 36, 185, cwæð þæt heo eode to hire and hi *wolde* forhycgan gif heo þæt bysmor forberan *wolde;* 36, 204; *Bede*, 222, 18; 306, 22; 308, 19; 380, 2; *W.*, 18, 3; 209, 26. In the exceptional construction in *AH.*, I, 246, 16, bodode him þæt him *wæs* Godes grama onsigende gif hi so Gode bugan *wolde*, the indicative is used in the apodosis to give greater vividness to the words of the homilist.

After expressions of command, threat, or promise, an infinitive is often used to take the place of the apodosis, while the protasis retains the regular preterite subjunctive; as *LS.*, 42, 298, he het *acwellan* þone cristenan philippum gif hit soð *wære;* similarly 38, 214. In *AH.*, II, 308, 18, the inflected infinitive is thus employed: þa þywde se casere hine *to swingenne* gif he him *sæde* swa hwæs swa he axode; and in *LS.*, 174, 96, a substantive takes its place: behet manigfealde *wita* buton heo *wiðsoce* þone soðan hælend; similarly 72, 365.

Examples are occasionally found of adjectival and other subordinate clauses, that play the part of a protasis; the preterite subjunctive is regularly employed; as *AH.*, II, 338, 34, God gecwæð þæt ælc synn, ðe *nære ofer eorðan gehet*, sceolde beon on ðissere worulde gedemed ['if it were not atoned for it should be judged']; 244, 17, cwæð þæt him selre *wære*, *þæt he geboren nære;* likewise *Bede*, 394, 24.

In the indirect interrogative sentence the same general constructions are observed as noted above: *AH.*, II, 242, 16, befran hwæt hi him feos *geuðon* gif he ðone Hælend him belæwan *mihte; AH.*, I, 82, 17, cydde him hu he ymbe *wolde* gif he him *gemette;* similarly *W.*, 212, 5.

At times when a continuous action is expressed or the statement is of universal application, the conditional sentence is in the present tense after a preterite governing verb. Here also is observed a variation of moods similar to that which takes place when the governing verb is in the present, as—indicative apodosis and subjunctive protasis: *AH.*, I, 26, 17, cwæð þæt nan man ne *mæg* beon gehealden buton he on Gode *gelyfe*,—subjunctive in both members: *AH.*, II, 94, 29, gesette canon þæt nan mæsse-preost wifhades mann *næbbe* buton hit *sy* his modor,—indicative in both members, as *John*, XI, 40, ne sæde ic þe þæt þu *gesyhst* wuldor, gif þu *gelifst*.

2. *The Conditional Sentence after Verbs of Thinking, etc.*

a. The governing verb in the present tense.

(1) Subjunctive in apodosis and indicative in protasis. As the general mood of subordinate verbs following verbs of thinking is the subjunctive, a large number of present subjunctive forms in the protases would naturally be expected; on the contrary we find that the independent construction of the indicative protasis is more regularly observed than in indirect clauses after verbs of saying: *CP.*, 77, 1, is wen þæt hio ða oðre wiers besmite gif hio hire *anhrinð*; *AH.*, I, 124, 14, sume men wenað þæt him genihtsumige to fulfremedum læcedome gif hi *andettað*; likewise *CP.*, 339, 19; 425, 1; *Boe.*, 164, 1; *Beow.*, 442, 1185; *LS.*, 426, 181; *W.*, 302, 11; *AH.*, II, 344, 33; 420, 12.

(2) Subjunctive in both members; an ideal or future relation is here generally expressed: *Boe.*, 144, 3, he wenð gif he þonne lust *begite* þæt he þonne *hæbbe* fulle gesælþa; *CP.*, 185, 25, wenð gif he hit him *iewe* þæt he him *nylle* geðafigean; similarly *Boe.*, 66, 2.

(3) Indicative in both members: *AH.*, II, 70, 14, we ondrædað us þæt ge þas getacnunga to gymeleaste *doð* gif ge eow swiðor be þam *gerecca*ð; *AH.*, I, 528, 21, ic wene þæt þas word ne *sind* eow full cuðe gif we hi openlicor eow ne *onwreo*ð. Here

are to be placed such constructions as *AH.*, II, 462, 22, se ðe hungre acwelð we gelyfaþ þæt he *gegæð* Gode buton he þe swiðor forscyldgod *wære; W.*, 135, 14; the subjunctive is due merely to the use of *buton*.

There are a few examples of the ideal or unreal condition with the usual preterite subjunctive in both members, as *CP.*, 187, 2, ic wene þæt he hine *snide* slanclicor gif he him ær *sæde*. ['I ween that he would not have cut him if he had told him']. *Boe.*, 134, 20, 24, offers an excellent example of the change of construction due to the passage from the unreal to the logical condition, the preterite subjunctive being used in both members of the former and the present indicative in the latter: 20, hwi ne miht þu geðencan gif nan wuht full *nære* þonne *nære* nan wuht wana; 24, hwi ne miht þu geþencan gif þissa goda wana *is* ðonne *is* sum god full ælces willan.

b. The governing verb in the past.

The preterite subjunctive is here used very consistently in the protasis and usually the same form in the apodosis, though there are a few examples of the indicative: *AH.*, I, 82, 12, ðohte gif he hi ealle *ofslage* þæt se an ne *cetburste;* similarly 124, 25. The independent construction of the preterite indicative in the protasis is occasionally met with, as *W.*, 260, 18, wendest þu gif þu me *sealdest* owiht þines, þæt þe þonne *wære* þin wuldorgestreon eall gelytlad; similarly *AH.*, II, 2, 11.

3. *The Conditional Sentence after Verbs of Perception, Happening, etc.*

a. The governing verb in the present tense.

The construction in such cases is very regular: the ordinary usage is a consistent employment of the present indicative in both protasis and apodosis, as *CP.*, 377, 1, hie witon gif hiera niehstan friend *weorðaþ* wædlan, þæt hi *beoþ* ðonne fultemend to hiera wædle; similarly *CP.*, 273, 20; *Boe.*, 174, 24; *LS.*, 268, 92; *W.*, 155, 15; *BH.*, 181, 22; *AH.*, I, 528, 21. Whenever *butan* introduces the protasis the invariable subjunctive is

of course found, while the apodosis retains the indicative, as *AH.*, I, 96, 2, wite gehwa buton he his lustas *gewanige* þæt he ne *hylt* his cristendom; similarly *W.*, 49, 13; 270, 26.

When the ideal or unreal condition is to be expressed, the preterite subjunctive is used in both members of the conditional sentence; as *Boe.*, 242, 6, ic wat gif se delfere ða eorðan no ne *dulfe* ðonne ne *funde* he hit no; similarly *Boe.*, 210, 8; *Matt.*, XXIV, 43. The indicative is occasionally found in the apodosis, due doubtless to the strongly objective nature of the governing verb, as *Boe.*, 34, 11, ic wat gif þu me *hæfde* fullne anweald ðines selfes, ðonne *hæfdest* ðu hwæt-hwega on þe selfum.

b. The governing verb in the preterite.

Examples of this construction are not often found, but the subjunctive appears to be the mood in common use in both protasis and apodosis, as *AH.*, II, 454, 13, hit wæs gewunelic þæt gif hwæm sum færlec sar *become*, þæt he his reaf *totære;* similarly 166, 30.

In indirect conditional sentences after verbs in the present tense there is a noticeable tendency to retain the indicative in the protasis, especially if the governing verb is usually followed by this mood; and often, when the regular subjunctive is used in the apodosis, there is a seeming independence of expression and an almost complete retention of the direct construction in the protasis. On the contrary, when the tense of the governing verb is past, the subjunctive is very consistently employed in the protasis after verbs of all kinds. These separate tendencies are, I think, to be explained by the peculiar characters of the two tenses. In the present tense there is a nearer approach to direct narration in which the logical conditional sentence has always the indicative in the protasis, and in many cases the event narrated is presented as actually taking place before the eye. The past tense on the other hand has not this picturesque quality; the transition to direct dis-

course is not so easy or frequent; and, as the hypothetical statement contained in the protasis is made at a time remote from the vivid present and often with regard to an action in the future, there is naturally a strong entrance of the moments of uncertainty and unreality; hence arises the predominant use of the subjunctive in conditional sentences after a verb in past time.

The inversion of the protasis by reason of the omission of the conditional conjunction does not often occur in indirect discourse; examples are *W.*, 228, 7, ic sæcge þæt on þam monðe þæt ge scoldon ealle forweorðan, *nære þære halgan Scā Marian gebed*, and *AH.*, II, 68, 7.

With regard to the use and position of the conjunction *þæt* in the indirect conditional sentence, the following observations may be noted. In the arrangement, apodosis-protasis, the conjunction is universally placed before the apodosis, as *Beow.*, 591, sæcge ic *þæt* næfre Grendel swa fela gryra gefremede gif þin hige *wære*. In the arrangement, protasis-apodosis, the position of the conjunction between the two members is the rule, as *Mark*, XIV, 55, he bæd gif hit beon mihte *þæt* he on þære tide fram him gewite. Its position before the protasis is, however, quite common, as *Matt.*, XXIV, 43, witaþ *þæt*, gif se hiredes ealdor wiste on hwylcere tide se þeof towerd wære, he wolde wacigean. There are only occasional examples of its position before both members; as *AH.*, I, 40, 34, hit wæs gewunelic *þæt*, gif ænig wimman cild hæfde, *þæt* mon sceolde mid stanum oftorfian. Since, in this arrangement, the principal indirect clause is separated from the governing verb by the intervening protasis, the conjunction is not infrequently omitted entirely, and it is sometimes difficult to draw any dividing line between the direct and the indirect conditional sentence. Of 114 indirect conditional clauses contained in various Anglo-Saxon writings, 54 had the arrangement, apodosis-protasis; in all of these *þæt* was used before the apodosis. In the 60 sentences with the arrangement, protasis-apodosis, *þæt* was used between the two members in 40, it was found only before the protasis in 8, while in two examples the con-

junction was placed before both members. In the remaining 10 *þæt* was entirely omitted.

B. Other Complex Sentences in Indirect Discourse.

With the exception of clauses introduced by *þeah* and *ær*, both the subjunctive and indicative are employed in the subordinate clause. Under ordinary conditions the indicative is used when the principal clause also contains an indicative and frequently even when its verb is in the subjunctive. The subjunctive is employed in the subordinate clause, when the latter is a hypothetical or assumed statement, when the modal idea that causes a subjunctive in the main clause pervades the subordinate, and also in many cases where the principle of attraction requires the same mood in the subordinate as in the main clause.

1. *The Subordinote Clause in the Subjunctive.*

The subjunctive is universally used only in two constructions: (1) In the concessive sentence, as *Bede*, 220, 29, ondette he þæt he wolde cristen beon, *þeah* he ne furðum þa fæmnan *onfenge;* similarly *CP.*, 99, 6; 415, 32; 423, 30; *LS.*, 34, 160; 36, 209; 266, 77; *AH.*, II, 246, 5. (2) In temporal clauses introduced by *ær* or *ærþam*, as *LS.*, 162, 244, het se æðela cyning þæt Florus hine gespræce ærþam he þonon *ferde; Or.*, 56, 19, aðas gesworon þæt hi næfre noldon æt ham cuman ær hie þæt gewrecen *hæfden;* likewise 50, 11; *AH.*, I, 136, 6; *Matt.*, XXVI, 34.

2. *The Subordinate Clause with Variation of Mood.*

a. The Adjective Clause.

(1) In the indicative.—The indicative is the usual mood in the adjective clause when the latter is used to make a simple, colorless statement with regard to a certain object; in such

cases the naked adjective or participial form could be substituted for the clause without detriment to the sense; as *Bede*, 136, 17, ic lære þæt þæt tempel and þa wigbedo þe we *halgodon* þæt we þa hraðe forleosan; *CP.*, 63, 14, geðencen þæt þa þe ðone *wilniað* þæt hie mid hiora ðingengum hefigre ierre ne astyrien; 79, 2, is awriten þæt mon sceolde writan on þam hrægle, ðe Aron *bær* on his breostum, þa lare; similarly *CP.*, 259, 4; 277, 19; 387, 16; 449, 17; *LS.*, 464, 388; *AH.*, I, 610, 13.

The indicative is specially frequent in adjective clauses when the verb of the principal clause of the indirect expression is also indicative, and is almost universal in sentences following verbs of perception, as *CP.*, 109, 14, ða lareowas ongitað þæt þa þe him underðiedde *bioð* him to hwon God *ondræda*ð; similarly *CP.*, 143, 1; 220, 16; 383, 34; *BH.*, 13, 22; 125, 13; *Bede*, 88, 7; 386, 18; *Boe.*, 102, 24; *Matt.*, 5, 32; *Mark*, III, 29; VII, 20; X, 42; *Wid.*, 131.

(2) In the subjunctive.—In indirect expressions after verbs of saying, of advice and command, and of thinking and believing [Classes A and B], the moments of uncertainty, of exhortation, or of supposition, which directly affect the principal indirect clause, often pervade the subordinate clause and cause its verb to be used in the subjunctive; the subjunctive in the dependent sentence is often due also to a general and indefinite assumption made by the adjective clause; as *CP.*, 85, 5, tacnað þæt eall, þæt þæs sacerdes andgiet þurhfonan *mæge*, sie ymb ðone heofonlican lufan; *Bede*, 80, 24, bibead þætte se wer se ðe *wære* his wif gemenged þæt he sceolde wætre bebaðad beon; in such cases this relative construction may be regarded as another way of expressing the condition than by the usual protasis introduced by *gif*.[1] Additional examples are *CP.*, 95, 23; 215, 21; 243, 10; 279, 11; 285, 23; *Bede*, 130, 2; *BH.*, 49, 15; *W.*, 24, 6; *AH.*, I, 50, 15; 338, 34.

Very frequently, however, the subjunctive in the subordinate clause is to be explained as due to attraction to the subjunctive

[1] Mather, *The Conditional Sentence in Anglo-Saxon*, p. 47.

in the principal clause or to the effort to maintain consistency of mood-sequence in the indirect expression, as *CP.*, 191, 4, geleornigen þa fæderas þæt hii gode bisne astellen þæm ðe him underðiedde *sien;* similarly *Bede*, 388, 10, etc. Considering the fact that the indicative of the main clause of the indirect expression is accompanied almost invariably by the indicative of the adjective clause, and the subjunctive in most cases by the subjunctive, it is evident that the part played by attraction is a most important one.

b. The Adverbial Clause.

The observations with regard to the adjective clause apply also in general to the abverbial clause.

(1) With the indicative.—*CP.*, 271, 10, mon sceal læran þætte hie, ðonne hie sumne unðeaw *fleoð*, þæt hie ne sien to wiersan gecierde; 388, 19, hit is awriten þæt ure Hælend, þa he *wæs* twelfwintre, wurde beæftan his meder; *AH.*, I, 38, 12, geswuteliað þæt þær wunað Godes sibb þær se goda willa *bið;* *Bede*, 228, 21, ic þe secge, forðam þu ne *woldest*, þæt þu scealt sweltan; similarly *CP.*, 385, 24; *Bede*, 200, 2; *Boe.*, 76, 22; *LS.*, 346, 154; *AH.*, II, 24, 6; *Matt.*, VII, 28; *Beow.*, 411.

(2) With the subjunctive.—*Bede*, 156, 22, bæd he hine þæt he him ðæs arwyrðan treos hwylcnehwego dæl brohte þonne he eft *come;* *Or.*, 18, 31, norðeweard, he cwæð, þær hit smalost *wære* þæt hit mihte beon þreora mila brad; similarly *AH.*, I, 110, 30.[1]

VI. The Order of Words in Indirect Discourse.

The characteristic features of word-order in the Anglo-Saxon sentence have been considered by C. A. Smith in his

[1] The above general observations must suffice for this subject. A minute study of the Complex Indirect Sentence is reserved for a future paper.

dissertation, *The Order of Words in Anglo-Saxon Prose;* Dr. Smith selects *Or.* and *AH.* as representatives of the earlier and of the later period of the language respectively. To supplement his work on the dependent sentence, I have given below in a tabular form statistics of the order of words of all indirect statements contained in the greater part of Anglo-Saxon prose works. The symbols employed are those adopted in Dr. Smith's monograph.

A. Order of Words in the Indirect Declarative Sentence.

	Or.	*Bede.*	*CP.*	*Boe.*	*BH.*	*Chr.*	*LS.*	*W.*	*AH.*	*Gosp.*
a' . . . . vb.....	164	285	159	102	157	29	149	173	330	171
b' obj. + vb.....	10	32	18	9	18	2	21	38	53	10
c' vb. + obj.....	29	65	68	70	51	12	65	91	199	68
d' vb.....	83	152	153	181	119	31	119	124	336	155
a obj. + aux. + vb...	6	8	2	5	5	2	5	3	4	1
b aux. + obj. + vb....	20	34	18	10	8	10	21	24	81	6
c aux + vb.....	29	58	60	27	39	12	31	33	87	10
d obj. + vb. + aux...	27	21	16	7	5	17	15	11	26	1
f vb. + aux.....	19	64	14	10	19	16	12	14	50	8
g obj. + aux. + vb...	1	0	1	1	0	0	4	1	1	0
h aux. + obj. + vb...	3	2	0	1	1	4	9	5	10	0
i aux. + vb. + obj....	11	13	15	17	6	17	20	14	61	4
j aux. + vb.....	10	26	36	24	21	12	33	46	99	14
k obj. + vb. + aux....	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
l vb. + obj. + aux....	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
m vb. + aux. + obj...	2	0	0	1	1	0	8	5	2	0
n obj. + aux.....	0	21	1	1	5	0	7	8	8	3

Now, *a'*, *d*, and *f* are regular exponents of transposed order, while *c'*, *d'*, *h*, *i* and *j* represent the normal order of the independent sentence. The remaining varieties of word-order here indicated may be left out of account as furnishing no aid to the establishment of any principle of order. From the above table, therefore, we find that the relative proportions of transposed to normal order are as follows:

	Or.	*Bede.*	*CP.*	*Boe.*	*BH.*	*Chr.*	*LS.*	*AH.*	*W.*	*Gosp.*
Trans.....	4	4	2	[1	7	3	2	1	1	[7
Normal.....	3	3	3	3]	9	4	3	2	2	9]

There is thus observable a general tendency at all periods of the language to hold to the normal arrangement of words in Indirect Discourse; and furthermore, this tendency is always on the increase, especially toward the later period of the language. There is a very curious predominance of normal order in *Boe.* not only in indirect declarative, but also in indirect interrogative expressions.

This tendency to adhere to normal order is further illustrated by the large number of instances of inverted order to be found in indirect discourse. Examples of these may be grouped under the following heads:—

1. In indirect imperative sentences where the original order of words is preserved, as *AH.*, I, 30, 1, se Romanisca casere sette gebann þæt *wære on gewritum asett eall ymbhwyrft;* or where the inverted order is also required by the precedence of an adverb or of an adverbial phrase, as *CP.*, 27, 8, wæs beboden þætte on Arones breostum *scolde beon awriten sio racu.*

2. Where the principal indirect clause is the apodosis of a condition, whether or not preceded by *þonne;* as *AH.*, I, 124, 5, seo ealde æ bebead þæt gif he nære swutelice hreoflig, *wære þonne he his dome clæne geteald;* gif se sacerd hine hreofligne tealde, *þonne sceolde he þancian;* similarly *CP.*, 383, 31; *W.*, 155, 15. In such constructions the retention of the original inverted order is almost universal.

3. When the indirect expression is a correlative sentence, as *CP.*, 463, 33, þæt is þætte þæt mod swa swa hit God forsihð, *swa secð hit his agene gielp;* similarly *W.*, 238, 4; *AH.*, II, 446, 24.

4. When a direct or indirect object or an adverbial expression directly precedes the verb of the indirect clause, as *AH.*, I, 516, 26, is geswutelod þæt ælcum geleaffullum men *is engel to hyrde geset;* 600, 19, he geswutelode þæt æfre *beoð him gecorene men;* 446, 6, Drihten cwæð þæt on his Fæder huse *sindon fela wununga;* similarly *Or.*, 72, 20; 148, 16; *Bede*, 216, 23; *BH.*, 153, 27; 203, 23; 217, 28; 219, 11; 225, 4; *LS.*, 524, 612; 528, 668; *W.*, 18, 8; 19, 2; 82, 4; 88, 19; 291, 14; *AH.*,

I, 228, 21; 406, 16; II, 12, 23; 152, 15; 464, 33; 562, 20. There is at times a perceptible effort to preserve the original order of words, especially in Biblical quotations, as *AH.*, I, 446, 6 [quoted above].

5. When the substantive subject of the indirect sentence is followed by a long attributive expression, the sentence is often continued after this expression in inverted order, reference to the subject being made by the pronoun, as *CP.*, 383, 34, þæt hi geðencen þæt wif ðe ða geacnodan bearn cennað *ne fyllaðhie no mid þam hus ac byrgenna;* similarly 99, 6; 311, 14; 383, 33; *Bede*, 134, 18; *Boe.*, 20, 17; *BH.*, 29, 4; *AH.*, I, 134, 19; *Matt.*, VII, 28; XIII, 53.

Order of words when þæt is omitted.

1. Omission in the simple indirect sentence. Examples of this construction are very rare. Among the instances given in a former section [see *Omission of þæt*], there are several which cannot legitimately be termed indirect discourse but merely direct clauses introduced by verbs of command or petition, as *AH.*, I, 332, 12; 434, 13; 446, 13; *Boe.*, 40, 31; 98, 33. There are, however, thirteen clear-cut examples of true indirect discourse with no conjunction; the normal order is found in twelve, viz., *CP.*, 389, 11; 423, 19; *Bede*, 34, 8; 200, 25; *Boe.*, 82, 27; 182, 8; 192, 11, 29; *BH.*, 71, 25; *LS.*, 72, 273; *AH.*, I, 374, 4; *John*, XXI, 25. Transposed order is found only once: *Boe.*, 12, 22, ic wat ælc wuht fram Gode *com*, and this is probably due to the influence of the Latin: novi deumque esse respondi. We are at liberty, I think, to conclude from these statistics that Anglo-Saxon, like the Modern German, tends to return to the normal order whenever the conjunction is omitted.

2. Omission of *þæt* before the second or third coördinate clause of the compound indirect sentence. The arrangements of words in these clauses are as follows [examples of actual passage to direct discourse are, of course, excepted]:—

	a'	*b'*	*c'*	*d'*	*a*	*b*	*e*	*f*	*i*	*j*
CP.	10	2	4	10	0	0	1	1	0	2
Or.	12	1	2	7	0	0	1	0	2	1
Bede.	48	5	9	20	2	3	4	3	0	3
Boe.	7	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
BH.	33	1	5	4	0	0	5	2	0	0
Chr.	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0
LS.	29	6	7	5	0	0	0	0	2	5
AH.	59	5	30	34	2	16	14	1	8	10
W.	48	9	13	15	0	3	6	0	1	3
Gosp.	12	1	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	1

Comparing these figures with the statistics given above for the ordinary arrangement in the indirect sentence, it is seen that the proportion of normal to transposed order is here not essentially different. In general, therefore, the omission of the conjunction before the second or following indirect coördinate clauses does not effect the order of words.

B. The Order of Words in the Indirect Interrogative Sentence.

The statistics are as follows:—

	Or.	*Bede.*	*CP.*	*Boe.*	*BH.*	*Chr.*	*LS.*	*W.*	*AH.*	*Gosp.*
a'	54	80	79	54	59	10	73	42	158	72
b'	3	0	2	2	2	0	1	5	16	2
c'	2	2	2	13	0	0	12	1	13	2
d'	8	8	21	22	8	1	19	10	48	17
a	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	1	3	0
b	2	5	2	2	1	2	2	2	16	2
c	33	3	64	5	5	0	12	5	18	0
d	8	11	6	6	4	6	7	14	4	4
f	4	19	27	8	4	5	6	20	5	5
g	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	0
h	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0
i	1	1	2	0	2	2	0	5	0	0
j	0	1	3	2	1	7	2	14	2	2
k	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	1	0	0
l	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
m	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
n	1	1	0	5	0	1	0	3	0	0

The relative ratios of transposed to normal order for the various works are:—

	Or.	*Bede.*	*CP.*	*Boe.*	*BH.*	*Chr.*	*W.*	*LS.*	*AH.*	*Gosp.*
Trans.....	5	11	4	[13]	7	3	11	2	2	[4]
Normal.....	1	2	1	[8]	1	1	3	1	1	[1]

The Indirect Interrogative sentence shows a great difference from the Declarative sentence in its abundant use of the transposed order. There is, however, observable, though fainter than before, a tendency toward the normal order of words. The reason for this excessive predominance of transposed order is due to the fact that interrogative introductory words possess a strong subordinating power; each indirect interrogative expression is therefore felt to be truly dependent and the conscious effort to show this dependence occasions the frequent use of that order of words which most appropriately expresses the relation of subordination—the transposed order.

VII. The Infinitive Clause.

Anglo-Saxon shows a pleasing regard for variety of expression by the frequent use of the infinitive instead of the usual subordinate indicative or subjunctive clause.

The simple infinitive is not often found except after expressions of command or design. In such cases an accusative subject is at times associated with the infinitive, a construction corresponding to the accus. with infin. to be found in late Latin writers though unknown in classical Latin.[1] Only after *hatan* is the infinitive the prevailing construction, as *AH.*, II, 66, 22, het hi geedstaðelian þa burh Hierusalem [See *hatan*]. With

[1] J. G. Schmalz, "Lateinische Syntax," § 227, I. Müller's *Handbuch der Klassischen Altherthums-Wissenschaft*, II, 325.

other verbs of this kind it is less frequent, as *LS.*, 76, 439, bæd *hine* ealle *wacian; Jud.*, 58, þohte þa idese mid widle *besmitan;* similarly *AH.*, II, 182, 18; 254, 16; 262, 9; *El.*, 297, 979; 1018; 1101; *Dan.*, 359, 542; *An.*, 773, 779, 1614; *Byr.*, 170. The inflected infinitive is sometimes found, as *AH.*, I, 218, 30, circlice þeowas forbeodan *to secganne* ænig spel; similarly 122, 5; *CP.*, 55, 21; *Matt.*, XIX, 14.

Anglo-Saxon, like the other Germanic tongues, has some traces of the genuine subject-accusative construction,[1] but it is very rare: *AH.*, I, 590, 25, þæt þu wenst *me* for tintregum *geopenian* ðа gerynu; 48, 18, gemunde þæt godcunde gewrit, mannes *Sunu standan* æt Godes swiðran. After verbs of saying there is a near approach to this construction by the use of the accusative of the substantive and the predicate adjective, as *Gu.*, 90, þas eorðan *ealle* sægde *læne* under lyfte; similarly *BH.*, 165, 3; *Cr.*, 136. The extention of the subject-accusative construction in the later language is due to classical and romance influences.[2]

After verbs of perception this construction is more frequently employed than elsewhere, as *Wid.*, 101, hwær ic wisse goldhrodene *cwen* giefe *bryttian; Beow.*, 1970, geongne *guðcyning* godne gefrunon hringas *dælan; Dan.*, 1, gefrægn ic *Hebreos* eadge *lifgan; W.*, 2, 1, we geacsodon his *geceasterwunan beon* godes englas, and we geacsodon þæra engla *geferan beon* þa gastas soðfæstra manna; similarly *An.*, 183, 941, 1094; *Cr.*, 78; *Jud.*, 7, 246; *Beow.*, 2485, 2695, 2753, 2774; *Gu.*, 976, 1059; *Rid.*, XXXVI, 3. The subject-accusative in these instances is obviously used with more meaning than that of simple report, and it is necessary to bear in mind its stylistic character in order to get at the real meaning conveyed by these expressions: the traveller in his mind's eye views his queen distributing treasures as of old, the heroes in the *Beowulf* behold their youthful monarch engaged in the same gracious act, the poet of the *Daniel* brings before our eyes the picture

[1] *Ibid.*, § 224.

[2] Mätzner, *Englische Grammatik*, III, 28.

of the happy life of the ancient people of God, and Wulfstan gives a vivid description well in accord with his highly rhetorical style. A glance at the other examples will establish the fact that by the use of this construction the writer portrays the events narrated in the strongest manner, as actually taking place before our eyes; it is mainly the picturesque style of poetry. When the more vivid expressions of sense-perception are used this construction is still more frequent, as *Gen.*, 2777, þæt wif geseah for Abrahame *Ismaël plegan; Cr.*, 797, gehyred rodora *dryhten sprecan* reðe word; similarly *El.*, 243; *An.*, 847, 992, 1004, 1009, 1448, 1492, 1690; *Rid.*, XIV, 1; *Wand.*, 46; *Cr.*, 498, 506, 511, 740, 925, 1154; *Dan.*, 726; *Gen.*, 661; *AH.*, II, 272, 16; 468, 18; *W.*, 199, 13.

By far the most numerous instances of the infinitive clause are those modelled after the corresponding Latin construction; it is to be observed that, with the exception of the infinitive after *hatan*, there is here an obvious departure from the general Anglo-Saxon usage, for the construction can be regarded in no other light than a slavish imitation of a Latin original. It is very frequent in *Bede*, very rarely found elsewhere; as *Bede*, 404, 21, he geleornode monna cynne *ingong geopenian* þæs heofonlican lifes [didicerat generi humano *patere* vitae celestis *introitum*]; 322, 19, ic gemon *mec* geo *beran* þa iidlan byrðenne [*me* memini supervacua pondera *portare*]; similarly 36, 17; 58, 9, 19; 80, 31; 82, 4; 84, 2; 88, 4; 138, 10; 178, 31; 186, 4; 190, 21; 206, 31; 232, 30; 264, 27; 266, 13; 270, 23; 286, 17; 288, 11; 308, 26; 310, 3; 316, 21; 320, 3; 322, 19; 326, 27; 330, 13; 334, 4; 340, 7, 14, 19; 344, 21; 34; 426, 8; 430, 12; 440, 1; 456, 24; 460, 3; 462, 18, etc.

As the translator of *Bede* followed the Latin in this respect more closely than any other writer, a careful study of this work will enable us to determine the exact influence of the Latin infinitive construction upon the Anglo-Saxon idiom. I present the following statistics: there are in *Bede* 331 Latin infinitives following verbs which act as introductions to indirect discourse; in 263 instances the Latin infinitive is rendered by

the regular Anglo-Saxon construction with the subordinate clause; in 68 cases only does the Anglo-Saxon agree in construction with the Latin, 28 of these are found after *hatan* (its usual native sequence), 8 follow *geseon*, 6 occur after *gehatan*, 4 after *gehyran; witan, twygean, gelyfan, gelimpan*, and *secgan* are each followed twice by the infinitive; while *bebeodan, biddan, bewerian, ætiewan, gemunan, geleornian, læran, oncnawan, ongytan, tellan, þyncan*, and *wenan* are followed once by this construction. Since the infinitive clause is quite frequent after *hatan* and verbs of perception, we may conclude from the above statistics that the influence of the Latin infinitive construction upon the Anglo-Saxon is very slight even in the closest translations.

VIII. Relation of Indirect to Direct Discourse.

In all languages there has been more or less freedom in the syntax of the indirect sentence; the cause of this variation is due to the two different points of view with which these expressions are regarded; the interest may be centered about the speaker and the time when the statement is made, in which case regularity of syntactic structure is generally the result; in many cases, however, the attention is directed more especially to the statement itself, and oftentimes, by reason of this, all connection with the governing verb is lost sight of and the exact words or contents of the narration are given in direct form. This intermingling of the indirect and direct constructions is found in the earliest periods of language. The Hebrew shows a most primitive condition in that, without being preceded by the indirect construction, the contents of the statement are given in direct form immediately after the verb of saying. In the Greek (especially in Homer, see *Iliad*, 368 ff.) there are frequent instances in which a governing verb of saying is followed by a series of indirect clauses, and at last the direct words are taken from the mouth of the speaker to give a more energetic conclusion. Latin furnishes numerous examples of

the same construction: "It must be remembered," says Prof. Gildersleeve [*Latin Grammar*, § 652, Rem. 1], "that Oratio Obliqua is necessarily less accurate in its conception than Oratio Recta, and hence it is not always possible to restore the Oratio Recta from the Oratio Obliqua with perfect certainty; hence, when accuracy is aimed at, the narrator takes the point of view of the speaker, and at last passes over to Oratio Recta." Similar constructions are found in Old High German and Slavic.

In Anglo-Saxon this transition to direct discourse is by no means infrequent; it is due to a great extent to the requirements of style; the advantages to be derived from its use are obvious: it is less cumbersome, more accurate, and lends a greater degree of vivacity to the narrative.

It is employed in some cases to emphasize an important or contrasted statement, as *LS.*, 36, 185, cwæð þæt heo eode to hyre licgendre on læceshiwe and hi wolde forhycgan gif heo þæt bysmor forberan wolde, *ac ic hrymde sona mid sarlicre stœmne; AH.*, I, 596, 30, cweðende þæt swa halig man hangian ne sceolde; æðele lareow ne sceolde swa þreowian, ac sceolde beon alysed, *forðam ðe he ne geswicð soð to bodigenne.*

It is very frequent after expressions of saying, happening, and the like, when the narrative consists of a number of coördinate clauses; the indirect form is regularly employed in the first or first few clauses and the remaining statements use the direct construction, as *AH.*, I, 452, 12, cwæð þæt seo fyrd wicode wiþ þa ea Eufraten, and seafon weard-sett wacodon ofer þone casere. *Þa com þær stœppende sum uncuð cempa and hine ðurhdyde, and Iulianus þa forswealt;* 230, 19, we rædaþ þæt þa heafod-men gebrohton Cristes apostolas on cwearterne, *þa on niht com him to Godes engel*, etc.; 44, 9, we rædaþ þæt þa apostolas gehadodon seofon diaconas; *þœra diacona wœs se forma Stephanus. He wœs swiðe geleafful*, etc.; *CP.*, 379, 6, ðæt is se cwide hu mon þæt feoh befæste þæm ciepmen ðe he scolde forðsellan to wæstme, *and þa forðy ðe he forwandode . . . . þa geaf he hit to unðances and his eac micelne dem; AH.*, I,

152, 2, her is geræd on þisum godspelle þæt se Hælend gename onsundron his twelf leorning-cnihtas and cwæð to him . . . . *þa nyston his leorning-cnihtas nan andgiet; LS.*, 488, 16, Þa gelamp hit æt sumum cyrre þæt he ferde into anre byrig þe mon constantinopolim nemneð; and þanon into Efese; *þa he ða þreo burga gefaren hæfde þa het gelangian him*, etc.; similarly *CP.*, 181, 18; *Chr.*, 373, E, 36; *Bede*, 352, 15; *BH.*, 213, 29; *W.*, 221, 7, 10; 223, 8; 227, 15; 233, 2; *AH.*, I, 114, 1; 152, 2; 340, 23; 470, 14; II, 96, 19; 104, 30; 272, 13; 296, 2; 542, 18.

In *Chr.*, 84, 39, we notice the rare example of the direct together with the indirect expression in the first dependent clause: þa cwædon hie þæt hie þæs ne onmunden *þon ma þe eowre geferan þe mid þam cyninge ofslægene wæron.* [A and C, *eowre;* B, D, E, *heora.*]

One of the finest passages that can be selected to illustrate the transition to direct discourse is the well-known account of the voyages of Othere and Wulfstan [*Bright's Anglo-Saxon Reader*, p. 42; *Or.*, 19, 32]. The introductory verb is *secgan;* the narrative is a long one, and it can be seen that if indirect discourse were kept throughout, the manner of narration would be simply intolerable. Let us note the steps taken by the writer to present the statement in an acceptable form. The first two sentences follow the laws of indirect speech in every particular: Wulfstan sæde þæt he *gefere* of Hæðun, þæt he *wære* on Truso, etc. As the formal connection with the governing verb becomes less distinct, the indicative is employed: þæt þæt scip *wæs* ealne weg yrnende under segle. From this point on the narrative is continued by giving the substance of Wulfstan's description: Wenoðland *him* wæs on steorbord and on bæcbord *him* wæs Langoland; and finally his exact words are quoted: and þonne Burgenda land wæs *us* on bæcbord and Wenoðland wæs *us* ealne weg on steorbord. In *Boe.*, 166, 27 ff. and 194, 2 ff. there is a like use of indirect and direct constructions after *gelympan* and *gebyrian;* the general sense of indirect report is expressed by the occasional

insertion of *secgan* with the dependent construction in the following clause, and by the use of *sculan*. A similar construction is found in *Bede*, 154, 23–28. The parenthetical insertion of *he cwæð* to preserve the sense of quoted statement is seen in *W.*, 89, 8, he sæde eac þæt þeoda sceoldan winnan heom betweonan and fela eorð-styrunga geweorðan on worulde, and þæt beoð þas angin, *he cwæð*, þara sarnessa.

In many instances, however, these constructions can be regarded in no other light than as direct discourse introduced by a verb of saying or happening; but, instead of the entire preservation of the direct form, the clause immediately following the introductory verb falls into the indirect construction, while the remaining part of the statement is retained in its original form; as *Boe.*, 216, 19, swa mon segð þæt an næddre wære þe hæfde nigon heafda, *and simle gif mon ænra hwilc ofsloh, þonne weoxon þæt seofon; þa gebyrede hit þæt þær com se foremære Erculus to; þa ne mihte he geðencan hu*, etc.; *AH.*, II, 372, 1, Gregorius sæde þæt se mon se ðe ða micelan feorme worhte is ure Hælend Crist; *he sende his þeowan to lætigenne manncynn; and ælc þe þa boda*ð *is Godes bydel;* similarly 330, 24; 354, 29; *Matt.*, XVI, 18; *W.*, 156, 7; 205, 5; also many of the examples introduced by *gelimpan*, and the like, indicated in a preceding paragraph. The indirect construction is occasionally followed by a long stretch of direct discourse, giving merely the contents of the statement; as *AH.*, II, 332, 9, Paulus awrat þæt he *wære* gelædd up to heofonum *oððæt he becom to þære ðriddan heofonan; and he wæs gelæd to neorxna wange and þær þa gastlican dygelnysse gehyrde and geseah*, etc.

In expressions introduced by verbs of command and petition, there is a decided gain in style by bringing in the direct imperative form after the usual indirect sequence with the subjunctive; as *CP.*, 213, 14, ic eow healsige þæt ge us to hrædlice ne *sien* ætyrede from gewitte, ne *ondræda*ð for nanes mannes wordum [rogamus vos ut non cito moveamini a vestro sensu]; *AH.*, I, 334, 25, Ic bidde eow þæt ge *beon gemyndige* ðæs Lazares reste, and *do*ð swa swa Crist sylf tæhte; *Boe.*,

260, 2, Ic bidde þæt þu me *gewissige* bet þonne ic awyrhte to þe, and *gewissa* me to þinum willan and *gestaðela* min mod and *gestranga* me; *W.*, 229, 6, Ic hate þæt ge *gangen* to minum ciricum, and þær ge eower geswinc *sellað; AH.*, II, 20, 20, Ic sette nu þis gebann on eallum minum þæt nan man ne *beo* swa dyrstig þæt he ænig word cweðe . . . . gif hit hwa þonne doð, he *sceal* þolian his æhte; 296, 2, Ic þe bebeode þæt þu *gewite* of þyssere stowe and *far* to Westene, and þu nanum men on þinum fram-fære ne *drece; LS.*, 240, 32, þa cwæð se dema þæt hi oðer þæra *dydon*, swa hi þam godum *geoffrodon* and arwurðnysse hæfdon, swa hi þa offrunga *forsawon* and gescynde wurdon; *smeaga* nu, etc.

The transition from the subjunctive to the indicative in the second and following coördinate clauses after a verb of saying or thinking is probably an application of the same principle that causes the passage from indirect to direct discourse; in such cases the conjunction *þæt*, the formal bond of connection, is almost always absent and the statement is naturally in some degree independent of the governing verb. This is of common occurrence in Anglo-Saxon; as *CP.*, 85, 26, oðrum monnum ðyncð þæt hie mæstne demm and mæste scande *ðrowigen* and hie forswencte *beo*ð for worulde; 107, 18, ic cwæð þæt æghwelc monn *wære* gelice oðrum acenned, ac sio ungelicnes hira gearnung hie *tieh*ð sume [dixisse me memini quod homines natura æquales gemit, sed variante meritorum culpa postponit]; *LS.*, 62, 202, sæde þæt he næfre on his life ne *come* neah wife, ac *heold* his clænnysse; *Boe.*, 140, 15, ic ær sæde þæt sio soðe gesælþ *wære* god and of þære soðan gesælþe *cuma*ð eall þa oðre god; *Bede*, 164, 29, secgað men þæt þæt *gelumpe* þæt he *sæte* æt his undernswæsendum, and him *wæs* hefed beod [fertur quia consedisset ad prandium positasque esset in mensa coram se discus argenteus]; *BH.*, 159, 22, Mattheus wæs cweðende þæt Drihten *astige* on sume tid on anne munt mid mycelre werode and þa *gesæt* he on þam munt; *W.*, 240, 26, we wendon þæt þu *wære* godfyrht and *hæfdest* gastlice geberu beforan us; similarly *BH.*, 29, 15; *AH.*, I, 196, 33; 532, 29.

When an adverbial clause of time, place, condition, or concession comes between the governing verb and the principal dependent clause, the connection between the latter expressions is much weakened, *þæt* is frequently omitted and the principal indirect clause put in inverted order, with the use of the same mood as would be required in the corresponding direct statement; as *Bede*, 190, 8, sægde he þæt in þa tid . . . . *þa wæs geslegen sum leornung-man;* 161, 21, secgaþ men, þa Oswald biscepes bede, *þa wæs him sended oðer biscop; Boe.*, 142, 13, hu ne miht þu geðencan gif þa god wæron þære soðan gesælþe limu, *ðonne wæron hi hwæthwegu todæled; BH.*, 29, 4, geþencean we eac gif oðre nyten wære to halsigenne, *þonne onfenge he heora hine;* similarly *Boe.*, 210, 8; 216, 19; *AH.*, I, 134, 13; *Chr.*, 358, E. 26.

In late Anglo-Saxon, especially when allusions are made to the Scriptures or to the writings of the Fathers, there are frequent examples of the employment of *þæt* with the paratactic sentence. The direct narrative is evidently used here to preserve the exact words of Holy Writ and of the no less sacred patristic writings; as *AH.*, I, 360, 31, be him awrat se witega Iesaias þæt he *is* stemn clypiende on westene; 542, 19, he him behet þæt hi ofer twelf domsetl sittende *beoð;* 528, 30, Gregorius spræc and cwæð þæt ure Drihten as *manað* hwilon mid weorcum; efne he asende his leorning-cnihtas . . . . he *sceal* beon Godes bydel; *LS.*, 214, 79, se apostol behet þam þe healdaþ clænnysse þæt hi *synd* Godes tempel; similarly *AH.*, I, 338, 9; 364, 13; II, 394, 31.

Direct discourse with the conjunction is a marked characteristic of the *Anglo-Saxon Gospels;* it is due to the influence of the corresponding Greek construction with ὅτι, through the medium of the Latin;[1] as *Luke*, VII, 16, cwædon þæt mære witega on us aras. The same construction is also observable in the Gothic, due to the same cause: qiþandans þatei praufetus mikils urrais in unsis.

---

[1] See E. H. Spieker, "On Direct Speech introduced by a Conjunction,"—*American Journal of Philology*, V, 221.

Results.

The following is a brief summary of results established by this study of Indirect Discourse.

1. The use of the conjunction *þæt* in the compound indirect sentence is regulated by the requirements of emphasis or contrast; its use in the complex sentence is determined by the conscious effort to attain ease and clearness of style. The omission of the conjunction is mostly found in the complex indirect sentence with a preceding subordinate clause; in the simple sentence this omission is extremely rare.

2. The subjunctive of reported statement after simple verbs of saying is the rule in early Anglo-Saxon; but chronologically considered, the use of the subjunctive and of the indicative after such expressions vary inversely. In the Alfredian period, since the subjunctive is the usual mood of indirect discourse, the indicative conveys a decidedly objective conception; in the later period, the great levelling of moods under the indicative forms tended to limit the use of the subjunctive after verbs of saying to expressions of possibility, contingency, condition, etc.

The presence of an intervening coördinate or subordinate clause between the indirect clause and its governing verbs frequently weakens the sense of dependence and causes the use of the indicative instead of the regular subjunctive.

When the nature of the expression is objective, as is the case with verbs of perception, the indicative is employed in the dependent clause; this mood is also used after some verbs of saying with objective force, as *cyðan*.

The use of the subjunctive in the indirect interrogative sentence is somewhat more extensive than its use in the declarative sentence; it is employed when the interrogative idea is prominent and is sometimes due merely to the interrogative form; but, in most cases, the dependent clause has a descriptive rather than an interrogative force, and the use of mood is the same as in the declarative expression.

3. *Sculan*, in its original sense of duty or obligation, is frequently used in indirect discourse; from this is developed the idea of duty imposed by another, and hence its regular employment after verbs of command; its primitive meaning is further extended to denote an event sure of fulfillment in the future, and thence it easily passes into expressions of prophecy and even of simple future action. The duty implied in a conformity to universal usage accounts for its frequent employment after expressions of custom. As an indication of mere possibility, it is used to show that the truth of a statement is not vouched for by the narrator, and it is occasionally employed as a sign that the statement is false.

Willan has a somewhat similar development; from the expression of pure volition, it passes through the intermediate stages of promise, threat, and prophecy, to be used as an indication of the simple future expression. As denoting the action of the will for an indefinite period, it is used after expressions of custom.

In later Anglo-Saxon there is a decided tendency to indicate ideas of probability, contingency, and the like, not by the simple subjunctive, but rather by the periphrastic constructions with *sculan*, *willan*, *magan*, and *motan;* this tendency is greatly favored by the breaking-down of the old subjunctive forms.

4. In Indirect Conditional Sentences the subjunctive is regularly used in the protasis when introduced by *butan*, and in both members of ideal and unreal conditional expressions; it is the prevailing mood when the governing verb is in past time, especially if it be a verb of belief or command. After simple introductory expressions and verbs of perception the indicative is more frequently employed; this mood is also in general use whenever a governing verb is in the present tense, since in this case there is a decided tendency to revert to direct discourse.

The subjunctive is always used in complex indirect sentences introduced by *ær*, *oð*, and *þeah*. In other complex sentences there is variation of mood, dependent mainly upon the character of the governing verb.

5. There is a strong tendency, especially in later Anglo-Saxon, to employ the normal order of words in indirect discourse; adherence to the word-order of direct speech is further shown by the remarkable persistence of inverted order in the indirect expression. When the conjunction *þæt* is omitted in a simple indirect sentence there is almost exclusive use of the normal order, but the omission of this conjunction before the second or following coördinate clause of a compound sentence produces no affect upon the order of words. Transposed order is most consistently observed in indirect interrogative sentences, due probably to the conscious effort to express subordination.

6. The infinitive clause is mostly used after *hatan*, with less frequency after other verbs of command. The subject-accusative construction is in general use only after verbs of perception in the picturesque language of poetry; its occurrence after verbs of saying or thinking is very rare, and is mostly confined to direct copyings of the corresponding Latin construction; this method of rendering the Latin prevails, however, to no great extent even in the closest translations.

7. Transition from Indirect to Direct Discourse is very frequent in Anglo-Saxon. It is to be generally observed that the farther the clause is removed from the governing verb, its sense of dependence is diminished and there is a stronger tendency to revert to the direct construction. This transition is specially frequent when the statement is a lengthy one, by which means a long continuation of indirect constructions is avoided. It is often employed to emphasize an important statement or to establish a contrast, and has a distinctively stylistic force after verbs of command or petition.

J. Hendren Gorrell.

LIFE.

I was born in Lexington, Va., on August 25th, 1868. In 1884 I entered Washington and Lee University and received the degree of A. B. in 1888. After two more years of study at the University I received the degree of M. A. in 1890. During the session of 1890–91 I was Instructor in English and Modern Languages at that institution. In October, 1891, I entered the Johns Hopkins University, selecting English as my principal subject, and German and History as my subsidiary subjects. My work has been under Professors Bright, Browne, Wood, Learned, Bloomfield, Adams, and Emmott, to all of whom I offer sincere thanks for many kindnesses. I desire to acknowledge my special obligations to Professor James W. Bright of the Johns Hopkins University and Professor James A. Harrison of the University of Virginia for their helpful sympathy always generously extended.

Joseph Hendren Gorrell.